DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 374 333 CE 067 307

AUTHOR	Greenland, Annette, Ed.
TITLE	Visions and Revisions for the 21st Century. Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Commission of Professors of Adult Education (Dallas, Texas, November 19-21, 1993).
INSTITUTION	Commission of Professors of Adult Education.
PUB DATE	Nov 93
NOTE	102p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Education; Adult Educators; *Change Strategies; *College Programs; *Educational Change; Educational Needs; Educational Research; Educational Theories; Educational Trends; *Financial Support; Foreign Countries; Fund Raising; Futures (of Society); *Graduate Study; Higher Education; Instructional Improvement; International Cooperation; Labor Force Development
IDENTIFIERS	Canada; United States

ABSTRACT

These proceedings contain the papers presented during the opening and closing panels of the 1993 annual conference of the Commission of Professors of Adult Education (CPAE) as well as reports from the five special interest groups (SIGs) that met during the conference. The following papers/reports are included: "Opening Session: Introductory Remarks" (Brockett); "Tribute to Paul Bergevin" (Stubblefield); "Developing Support for Adult Education Programs on the University Campus: Setting the Stage for the General Session Panel" (Quigley); panel discussion (Caffarella, Sisco, Kasworm, Garrison, Hiemstra); "Life at the Margins: Post-Conference Reflections on the Opening Panel" (Quigley); "Our Past, New Visions, New Directions: Framing the Closing Panel" (Courtenay); "Alternative Ways of Addressing Change in Adult Education: An Engagement in Polyrhythmic Discourse" (Sheared); "Seven 'Excellent Ideas' for Rebuilding the Intellectual Vitality of Adult Education" (Hemphill); "Some Comments on the Crises of Academic Adult Education" (Schied); "Adult Educators: Outspoken and Visible?" (Guy); "Our Past, New Visions, New Directions: Observations and Thoughts on the Closing Panel on Strengthening Graduate Departments" (Blunt); "The Future of Adult Education Research: Beyond the Paradigm Wars and Intra-Disciplinary" (Blunt); "Final Comment: Closing Session of the 1993 Conference" (Brockett). The following SIG reports are also included: "Critical Theory Special Interest Group" (Guy); "Human Resource Development Special Interest Group"; "International Special Interest Group" (McIntosh, Bersch); and "Research and Theory Building Special Interest Group" (Ferro). The activities of the instructional improvement SIG are summarized in the following reports: "Textbook Authors--Preaching or Practice?" (Polson) and "Approaches to Developing Critical Reflection" (Brookfield). Concluding the proceedings is a list of conference participants. Appended are the 1993 annual report of doctorates conferred in adult education (compiled by Lund and Mason) and the following reports: "Strengthening University Support for Adult Education Graduate Programs" (Knox et al.); "Summary of Interviews with CPAE Institutions" (Quigley); and "Strengthening University Support for Adult Education Graduate Programs: Western Canadian Perspectives" (Sork). (MN)

ED 374 333

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Commission of Professors of Adult Education
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Visions and Revisions
for the
21st Century

Proceedings of the
1993 Annual Conference

Commission of Professors of Adult Education

Annette Greenland, Editor

The 1993 annual conference of the
Commission of Professors of Adult Education
(CPAE)
was held November 19-21 at the
Loews Anatole Hotel in Dallas, Texas

in conjunction with
the annual conference of the
American Association for
Adult and Continuing Education
(AAACE)

CPAE chair:
Ralph Brockett
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

1993 CPAE conference co-chairs:
B. Allan Quigley
Penn State University

Scipio A. J. Colin III
North Carolina State University

AAACE executive director:
Drew Allbritten
1200 19th Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20036

Preface

The vantage point of a proceedings editor is an unusual one. When I first approached the preliminary parts of the task, I was satisfied to work from a pleasantly general memory of the major activities which would eventually be represented by the volume I had agreed to produce. I recalled the earnest faces and voices of my colleagues as they described their experiences as faculty in particular institutional contexts. I felt anew the emotions stirred by their revelations of efforts to strengthen--or simply preserve--their graduate programs in adult education. I even had tape recordings of all the panelists' remarks, just in case my editorial endeavors needed a "you were there" boost. (Adrian Blunt would later label these artifacts my *in*audiotapes.)

As the parts of the proceedings began to arrive in printed form and on diskettes, I developed an appreciation for the professional tone of the manuscripts and for the variety of articulate views. I soon realized that this growing collection was going to be an important resource for the field. I was even more convinced when the "post-conference reflections" of Allan Quigley and Adrian Blunt arrived; they serve well their purpose of synthesizing and commenting on what we heard and saw in that Dallas meeting room.

I chose to put all of the theme pieces together to enable an uninterrupted reading, so you'll find the papers from the opening panel followed by those from the closing panel. The "in-between" events--news and papers from special interest groups--follow, along with a list of the conference participants and the institutions they represent.

Joyce Green, office manager for my department, smoothed the way for the accounting-and-billing procedures involved in doing professional-association business. Shirley Cherry helped put "on disk" the paper-only manuscripts I received. My graduate assistant, Karla Henricks, prepared the mailing. Their cheerful cooperation has been a special bonus.

Annette Greenland
1993 Proceedings Editor and
Assistant Professor of Adult Education
Department of Teaching Specialties
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Contents

	Page
Preface	
Opening Session: Introductory Remarks **Ralph Brockett**	1
A Tribute to Paul Bergevin **Harold Stubblefield**	2
Opening Panel	
Developing Support for Adult Education Programs on the University Campus	
Setting the Stage for the General Session Panel **B. Allan Quigley**	5
Panel Presentations	
Rosemary Caffarella	8
Burton Sisco	8
Carol Kasworm	11
D. Randy Garrison	16
Roger Hiemstra	17
Life at the Margins: Post-Conference Reflections on the Opening Panel **B. Allan Quigley**	21
Compilation of Strategies Contributed by the Participants in the 1993 CPAE Annual Conference	25
Closing Panel	
Our Past, New Visions, New Directions	
Framing the Closing Panel **Brad Courtenay**	29
Panel Presentations	
Vanessa Sheared	29
David Hemphill	33
Fred Schied	38
Talmadge G. Guy	42
Our Past, New Visions, New Directions: Observations and Thoughts on the Closing Panel **Adrian Blunt**	45

Special Interest Groups

Critical Theory 51

Human Resource Development 51

Instructional Improvement

Textbook Authors--Preaching or Practice? 52
Rosemary Caffarella, Betty Hayes, Roger Hiemstra, Burton Sisco

Approaches to Developing Critical Reflection 54
Stephen Brookfield

International 57

Research and Theory Building

Recent Developments in Learning Style Research 58
Waynne James

Research Perspectives in Adult Education 58
D. Randy Garrison, Roger Hiemstra, Ralph Brockett, Sharan Merriam, Adrian Blunt

The Future of Adult Education Research: Beyond the Paradigm Wars and Intra-Disciplinarity 59
Adrian Blunt

Final Comment: Closing Session of the 1993 Conference 65
Ralph Brockett

Participants List 66

Appendix A

Strengthening University Support for Adult Education Graduate Programs (the "Knox Report") 69

Summary of Interviews with CPAE Institutions 76

Strengthening University Support for Adult Education Graduate Programs: Western Canadian Perspectives (the "Sork Report") 81

Appendix B

1993 Annual Report of Doctorates Conferred in Adult Education 88
Diane A. Lund
Robert C. Mason

Opening Session: Introductory Remarks

Ralph G. Brockett
Chair, Commission of Professors of Adult Education
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

I would like to welcome each of you to the annual meeting of the Commission of Professors of Adult Education. This is an important time for our field. It is my hope that each of us can come away from this conference with some ideas that we can put into action back home at our universities.

I would like to take a moment to thank the members of the Executive Committee for their commitment over the past year. Scipio Colin and Allan Quigley have served as co-chairs for this conference. Annette Greenland is serving as editor of the proceedings for this conference. Brad Courtenay is completing his term on the Executive Committee and has played a major role in our efforts to examine the mission of the CPAE. Donna Amstutz is completing her term as secretary-treasurer.

Unfortunately, Scipio and Donna are unable to be with us. Scipio was unable to get here because of the airline strike. Donna has been in the hospital, but her colleagues from the University of Wyoming report that she is doing better. Scipio and Donna have played key roles this year and deserve a special thanks.

The theme for our conference this year is "Visions and Revisions for the 21st Century." Over the past three years, we have taken a hard look at the Commission of Professors--its mission, role, relationship with AAACE, and possible directions for the future. Now is the time to take action. Our purpose in this conference, as Allan will describe shortly, is to identify some concrete action strategies from the processes with which we have been engaged.

Before moving into our opening session, I would like to add a personal observation. I attended my first CPAE conference 15 years ago, in Boston in 1979. I remember the excitement of the first general session I attended, with David Deshler, Roger Bosher, and Kjell Rubenson discussing research directions for the field. What I especially remember is how, as a newcomer and a beginning doctoral student, I felt very welcome within the Commission. Several people who are in the room this evening were an important part of helping me feel welcome. It is my hope that those of you who are attending this conference for the first time can come away with the same sense that I felt 15 years ago. The Commission of Professors has been my professional home and the members have been a professional family to me.

Over the next two days we will be addressing some difficult and important issues that can have an impact on the future of what we do. I truly hope that we can take a close look at ourselves and put aside the differences that sometimes divide us.

One final observation: I am reminded this evening of the 1987 CPAE conference in Washington, DC, where Malcolm Knowles, Burton Kreitlow, and Cyril Houle discussed the early development of graduate programs in our field. I would like to recall two comments from that session: Cy

Houle pointed out that when the first program in adult education was established at Teachers College, Columbia University, it was viewed as anything but marginal. Indeed, the program was viewed with much enthusiasm and respect. In the same session, Burt Kreitlow described how the CPAE was where he "learned" how to be a professor of adult education.

I think there is much in these two comments to encourage and inspire us. This is our professional home and you are my professional family.

A Tribute to Paul Bergevin

Harold W. Stubblefield
Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University

Paul Bergevin died on April 26, 1993. His contributions to adult education theory, practice, and philosophy are often noted, but he remains an enigmatic figure. He did not attend many meetings of the Commission of Professors of Adult Education or of the Adult Education Association, so even among professors of adult education who were his contemporaries, he was not well known.

In 1947 Bergevin came to Indiana University (IU) to head the extension division's new program in community organization for adult education. His retirement in 1972 ended a 25-year career at IU.

Bergevin had ideas that extended far beyond doing extension work: He wanted to conduct research and be involved in graduate education. In his first year at IU, he developed and taught graduate courses in adult education and later introduced a research component in the field services program that extended across the state of Indiana. Gradually the graduate education component grew, and, in 1965, the Bureau of Studies in Adult Education (the new title of the unit) became part of the School of Education.

Multiple Roles

As director of the Bureau, Bergevin served in the several roles of administrator, field service consultant, researcher, and professor. For several years the community organization program was a joint effort with Purdue University and occasionally with Indiana State University and Ball State University. Bergevin recruited his early staff from graduate students at IU. In the early 1950s he recruited two doctoral students in the English department--John McKinley and Robert Smith--who gained recognition in their own right as adult education researchers and writers.

Bergevin shared, of course, ideas about adult education that were common in the post-war period among adult education practitioners, theorists, and professors. In some ways, he was clearly an innovator. The roots of his ideas about adult education can be traced to his experience as director of adult and vocational education in the public

school system at Anderson, Indiana. At Anderson he participated in what was known in the 1920s and 1930s as the foremen's club movement. This movement entailed, in part, the training of foremen and managers in human relations skills, in managing groups, and in planning educational programs. The movement's ideological foundations rested partially on the premise that workers, through training, would be able to participate in decision-making. Their participation in democratic decision-making would equip them to apply these skills to groups and organizations in the larger community. In many respects, Bergevin's work at IU expanded these basic ideas and small group training processes. His 25 years (1947-1972) can best be understood as an experiment in adult education.

In the early 1950s Bergevin moved away from the community organization approach to the institutional approach. He held that adult educators should work within the institutions of the community. Adults were more likely to participate in programs offered by the institutions in which they worked, studied, or worshipped. Institutions, not the community, are the locus of adult education activities.

The Indiana Plan

In support of this idea, Bergevin and his younger colleague, John McKinley, conducted a five-year study in churches that resulted in an intensive small-group approach to teaching adult education principles in institutional settings. The approach was called the Indiana Plan for Adult Religious Education. A model stripped of the church application was called Participation Training. During the church study, Robert Smith conducted a similar study with public libraries in Indiana. Later, faculty and graduate students would apply this training program to mental hospitals, general hospitals, corrections, adult basic education, business and industry, government, and the military. Because the initial research on the institutional approach to adult education was conducted in churches, IU gained a reputation as a center for adult religious education; that reputation would obscure Bergevin's achievements in developing principles for adult education practice.

The graduate education program placed importance on developing students' skills in managing small-group learning and developing programs. Beyond the required coursework, students developed skills through supervised internships and experience in Participation Training. All of the graduate program was based on demanding intellectual work. In this Bergevin was also an innovator. He called his introductory course "The Democratic Idea in Adult Education" and required students to read the works of the major thinkers of western political philosophy, beginning with Aristotle's Politics and coming finally to Grundtvig and Lindeman. A course on comparative adult education engaged students in the study of the history of adult education in the United States, England, and the Scandinavian countries. For several years the faculty required doctoral students to take two courses in Danish so that they could read Grundtvig's writings on the folk school in the original language. A course on "The Adult Citizen" examined the nature of citizenship and the concept of maturity in adulthood. It later became a course in adult developmental psychology.

In a time when adult education professors sought to establish the legitimacy of adult education in the university through an emphasis on empirical research, Bergevin chose, instead, a form of action research. He and his colleagues worked with Indiana communities and institutions,

through applied research, to identify and develop adult education principles. Through adult education institutes they taught these principles to persons not expert in adult education so that they might more effectively manage their lives. This approach reflected a certain view of "professional" adult education. Bergevin believed that university-trained adult educators brought an expertise to their work, but he also believed that the first task of "doing" adult education was to teach others what you--the expert--know about adult education principles and to assist people to take responsibility for their own learning.

For a typological scheme of adult education, Bergevin proposed three types: random-experiential learning, systematically organized programs, and Participation Training. Participation Training entailed a unique form of learning in which adults examined barriers to open communication and responsible behavior in relation to their own learning and that of others.

Optimism Waned

Running through Bergevin's writings are terms such as *the democratic idea*, *the free society*, and *the civilizing process*. However, Bergevin was not optimistic about human nature or institutional patterns of behavior. The learning theory that informed Participation Training was not behavioristic, humanistic, or developmental psychology, but psychiatry. Adults, when faced with situations that challenged the meanings they held, reacted defensively to protect their cherished belief systems. His early optimism about the institutional approach to adult education had faded by the time he published *A Philosophy for Adult Education* in 1967. He doubted that institutions would provide to their employees or members adult education that promoted personal growth and social responsibility as the Participation Training model did. Egocentered behavior, inability to tolerate ambiguity, and materialistic values were obstacles difficult to overcome. Adult education was not in and of itself a good thing. It could be used in the service of a totalitarian state or totalitarian church as well as in the service of civic responsibility.

It is fitting that we open this meeting on the theme of *Strengthening Graduate Adult Education Programs* with this tribute to Paul Bergevin and the Indiana Experiment in adult education. The IU program is a case study of the birth, growth, flourishing, and then death of a unique graduate adult education program. It lingered for awhile after Bergevin's retirement in 1972, but for many reasons--too complex to be explained here--its days were numbered. As is commonly said, some institutions or programs are the length and shadow of a person; such was the case of Bergevin and the program at Indiana.

Developing Support for Adult Education Programs on the University Campus: Setting the Stage for the General Session Panel

B. Allan Quigley
Conference Co-Chair
Penn State University

Good evening and welcome to the 1993 Commission of Professors of Adult Education annual conference. Before I introduce our panel for this general session and before we move ahead with the agenda, let me first ask the audience a few questions. Can I have a show of hands?

- First, over the past year, how many have been involved in some type of 'strategic planning'?

  *Hands of almost all of the 100-plus attendees go up.**

- Over the past year, how many have been involved with TQM [Total Quality Management]?

  One third of the hands go up.

- How many with CQI [Continuous Quality Improvement]?

  One third of the hands go up.

- How many have been involved with 'benchmarking' over the past year?

  One fourth of the hands go up.

Okay, almost every hand has gone up in response to one or more of these broad questions. Let us now try some more painful questions:

- Over the past year, how many have been involved with 'downsizing' in their own programs or others'?

  Half of the hands go up.

- How many have been involved with downsizing in their <u>own</u> programs alone?

  One third of the hands go up.

---

*The sizes of the "shows of hands" are the impressions of the author, not an actual count.

- How many have been involved with phasing out faculty positions--out of retirement or from cutbacks in their own program or another?

One quarter of the hands go up.

- How many have been involved with phasing out faculty positions--out of retirement or from cutbacks in their <u>own</u> programs only?

One quarter of the hands go up.

Now we turn to the real test:

- Over the past year, how many have wondered if they would even have a program next year?

Fifteen hands go up.

- Over the past year, how many have lain awake at night and wondered if they would have a job next year?

Ten hands go up.

We see a remarkable number of hands in this room--including those of the panelists--going up in response to these questions. While this "exercise" may begin as a game, it gets less and less amusing as we go along. Tonight's "game" has obviously been widespread and, as we will hear, a traumatic one for many.

Allow me to frame tonight's discussion this way: If the 1960s and '70s were about <u>access</u> and the '80s about <u>accountability</u> (to use a term from Kulich and Leirman's *Adult Education for the 1990s*), the 1990s are about <u>survival learning</u>, not only in the sense of survival of the planet or other urgent issues, but for everyday survival. We have survival learning at all levels of business and industry today. We clearly have it in university settings today as well.

In a real sense, this panel began at the Montreal CPAE conference when the program planners introduced the issues of program adjustment and directional change. The topic took on more urgency in Anaheim last year with an ad hoc committee called by Ralph Brockett to examine the question of CPAE mission. The pace quickened, more directly, with two other committees on strategies for building support for our programs on university campuses, chaired by Alan Knox in the U. S. and by Tom Sork and Bud Hall in Canada. Tonight's opening panel builds on that past momentum.

I know if Scipio Colin--the other half of the planning committee--could be here tonight, she would join with me in saying that the theme for this year's conference depends on two assumptions: first, that we as

a group are willing to get beyond self-congratulatory self-praise of our programs. For the most part, we tell of how well we are doing. Tonight and tomorrow we--Scipio and I--are asking that you also share program concerns and program strategies.

Secondly, we need to assume that we are willing and able to learn from each other. We are all we've got. Therefore, we are asking that people share in a more open way than we are perhaps used to doing and that we listen with a sense of identification, not a sense of judgment.

Finally, we don't assume, we hope--and perhaps it is hoping for too much--that we can affect our destiny as a field. We hope and believe that shared knowledge and a shared willingness to support each other can make an impact as we discuss ways to build support for Adult Education on our campuses. The question is, "How?"

It is my pleasure, then, to turn to our panel for the evening. To report on the work of their committees, Alan Knox from the University of Wisconsin and Tom Sork from the University of British Columbia.** And to my right, Rosemary Caffarella from the University of Northern Colorado, Burt Sisco from the University of Wyoming, Carol Kasworm from the University of Tennessee, Randy Garrison from the University of Calgary, and Roger Hiemstra from Syracuse University.

I'll now ask Alan to report, on behalf of his committee, their findings and suggestions for strengthening support for adult education on university campuses in the U. S. setting. Tom will report for Canada and the rest of the panel will follow.

Tomorrow, as you know, we will have a chance to work on your suggestions and ideas together in small groups. I will be working after the conference to develop a report*** capturing the thoughts of this conference.

**The full texts of the Knox and Sork reports are in the appendix of these *Proceedings*.

***See pp. 21-28.

Rosemary Caffarella
Panelist
University of Northern Colorado

My observations on the strategies recommended for strengthening university report for graduate studies in Adult Education are twofold: (1) The suggested strategies are sound, but do not address how professors may cope, and perhaps even thrive, in often very emotionally taxing situations. (2) Not enough emphasis was placed on our role as educators within the broader spectrum of programs in education, both internal to our colleges and schools and those which may be housed in other colleges.

In relationship to my first observation, my reading of the strategies was that they were very rational and objective, and took into consideration tactical planning and positioning of units and departments. Again, though, what was missing was the reality of carrying out such strategies in the real world of academe, where, for example, department chairs, deans, and vice presidents do not get along; individual egos get in the way of program needs; faculty infighting may be the norm; and some faculty may be counting the days to retirement versus caring about program change or survival. These realities create anger, pain, frustration, and sometimes even joyful feelings as we move through any change processes. Yet the strategies--in print--lost that flavor of the "feeling side" of program change and survival--a part of the process which often gets in the way of actually deciding to use or implement these strategies.

Second, the reality of most colleges of education is they are driven by K-12 needs, both in terms of resource allocation and time and effort of faculty and administrative staff. My sense, in relationship to this operating norm, is we need as professors of adult education to do a better job of working with the wider world of education, and in some cases need to stop giving the impression that we are "better" or are so different in our practice. Rather, we should expend some of our efforts on teasing out what we do as adult educators that could contribute to K-12 education, and in return what they have to offer us. Stronger partnerships between and among all units and departments addressing educational needs of people, no matter what their ages, could greatly enhance what we do as educators of adults.

Burton Sisco
Panelist
University of Wyoming

I understand my assignment to be to comment on the value and soundness of both the Knox and Sork reports and how they may be helpful at my institution. Also, can we make use of the recommendations?

First, let me express appreciation to Alan and Tom for their ideas and good work in preparing the two reports, and to the ad hoc committee for taking on this important topic. I have felt for some time that the

Commission of Professors needs to take a proactive stance in charting our destiny, and this work certainly moves us in the right direction.

I have been searching for a means of describing the challenges and opportunities ahead for those of us who teach adult and continuing education at the university level. Perhaps because of the time of the year, I think the classic Frank Capra movie starring Jimmy Stewart and Donna Reed, entitled *It's A Wonderful Life*, is most appropriate to capture the essence of our task today. As I'm sure most of you are aware, the movie depicts the struggle of George Bailey to leave his hometown of Bedford Falls for new and exciting places. Every time George gets ready to leave, something pops up that takes precedence and keeps him at home. He sacrifices for the good of others such as his father, brother, uncle, and the family lending agency, Bailey Brothers Building and Loan Association. He works hard at keeping the fiendish bank president, Henry F. Potter, from harming those who have relied on the Building and Loan for help in building their own homes. A financial crisis on Christmas Eve day sends George over the edge until Clarence, a guardian angel from heaven, helps him see how much he really has. As the movie concludes, most of the residents of Bedford Falls come to George's rescue and all is wonderful after all.

When *It's a Wonderful Life* first appeared in 1948, it was not all that highly regarded, even though the movie was nominated for five Oscars. The fact is, it was reviewed rather harshly. Now, the movie is a celebrated classic, shown on local television stations all across the United States. Perhaps that will be true of these reports and our work in the CPAE to date. We may not pay much attention to them; we may even choose to ignore their recommendations, since our own positions and status are secure. I suspect that if we choose to do this, a dangerous complacency may set in.

In many respects, I believe these reports may be another defining moment in the study of adult education as we wrestle with the past, present, and future. Certainly, the field has had other defining points in its storied history, but this may be the most important to date.

I really do think this is important stuff and commend the work to date, but <u>I don't think the reports go far enough</u>! In fact, the title of this session gives us a glimpse of our mindset: "The Future of Adult Education: Strategies for Change and Survival." Note how reactive and paranoid the message is. I'd retitle our session to "The Future of Adult Education in Academe: Strategies and Opportunities for Renewal and Growth."

Renewal is important in human development just as it is in organizations. I realize that this may sound harsh, but just because programs close or change does not mean that our overall situation is dire or bad. In fact, business closures are normal--even healthy--as restructuring occurs. Even the market-sensitive Total Quality Management literature talks about this. So let's not go overboard here and pronounce our field dead or terminally ill.

There are many good things in both reports and some excellent ideas about "look-fors" in the health of our academic programs. There are also some excellent strategies for building and maintaining support for our programs.

But what is missing or not mentioned? I believe we are stuck in the old paradigm of seeing adult and continuing education as peripheral to the mission of the college or faculty. I believe we are still promoting a number of dichotomies that may prove false under close scrutiny, such as a unique knowledge base, differences between adults and children/adolescents as learners, unique teaching and learning strategies for adults that have little significance for youth. (Gosh, I'm guilty of this myself.) I believe we are still trying to preserve our identity while perpetuating our marginality. I think this is a **Big Mistake.**

Having said this, what are the alternatives? What should we be doing differently? I would suggest the following as some initial ideas to consider:

1. We should continue building our knowledge and theory base while striving to improve practice.

2. We should keep stressing excellence and quality in all areas that academe values in our teaching, research, and service.

3. We should replace our dichotomous rhetoric with a developmental, lifespan perspective.

4. We should reevaluate our stance of not being active players in schools with youth, administrators, teachers, and parents.

5. We should involve ourselves in the school reform movement. Many of our ideas are **not** exclusive to adult education; they work with all age groups.

6. We should work vigorously at activating the metaphor of lifelong learning; it should be more than a slogan.

7. We should become active partners in translating our theories and concepts into school settings, working with school teachers and school leaders in the development and delivery of <u>good</u> education regardless of age.

8. We should reevaluate the cherished assumption that adult education is for graduate study only.

9. We should critically examine the separate-but-equal stance of many adult educators.

These are some ideas that I didn't hear or read in Alan's or Tom's reports that I believe need addressing; they may also be the very ideas that lead us to the vibrant future we may all be longing for. My biggest concern is not the ideas, since they are innocent enough. It is whether you and I are up to the task of strengthening our field of study and practice, for, in many respects, it is we who have perpetuated the isolation that now bears heavily upon our cause. My hope is that we can break these bonds and invent together an integrated discipline predicated on human development and social responsibility.

Thank you for listening to my reactions.

Carol Kasworm
Panelist
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

As many have noted, we are faced with the Chinese curse: "May we live in interesting times." Yes, we are on a roller coaster that has left its predictable path. We know that our society is in a turbulent shifting of economic foundations. We are facing diminishing resources to support the vital institutions of society and experiencing conflicting leadership and competing value systems. It is evident that although we are very knowledgeable about living in ambiguity, we continue to seek a comfortable control over our future. We recognize that our rational planning is not sufficient to keep us safe from harm's way. Yet we desire a remedy to assure a predictable support base.

I bring news again, along with the other panelists, that there is no "magic bullet"! I will suggest that we need to be aware and proactive about our current status as adult education graduate-program faculty, more proactive in support of our colleges within our respective universities, and more flexible and open to greeting these times as an opportunity for change. We need to learn new skills in dealing with ambiguity, or, as suggested by Tom Peters, "thriving in chaos."

For me, I view us in the midst of more difficult times, where all major societal institutions are facing a problematic future. In particular, I would like to speak from one perspective about the current status of colleges of education throughout the United States, the current frame of my own College of Education as it works to redefine itself, and the related status of our adult education program. As with each of the panelists, I will suggest there may be lessons to be learned in this review. However, one clear sign is important: We should not "hunker down and wait for the turbulence to pass." One of the worst strategies is to attempt to hibernate or create a balkanization of defenses to maintain the status quo. Rather, we need to actively engage in being a part of a broader future for our institution, our college, and our programs.

Uncertain Health of Colleges of Education

A mournful, tolling bell was heard at AERA, Atlanta, 1993. For those of you who were not present, Division J-Postsecondary Education focused many of its symposia upon current economic issues and the turbulent restructuring of higher education. The lead presentation and subsequent article by Dr. Sheila Slaughter* was particularly profound. In her article, "Retrenchment in the 1980s: The Politics of Prestige and Gender," she presented a disturbing background. Looking at 1980-1990 AAUP data of academic freedom and tenure cases, she examined a subset of the cases which looked at retrenchment, financial exigency, alleged

*Slaughter, S. (1993, May/June). Retrenchment in the 1980s: The politics of prestige and gender. *Journal of Higher Education, 64*(3), 250-282.

financial exigency, or program reduction. This data subset represented 17 institutions, split between public and private. Of the institutions which had been placed into an AAUP investigation with related issues of cutback or alleged retrenchment, the field of education was hardest hit, with 72 faculty cuts representing 36.7% of the total 196 cuts.

From her analysis, she suggested that postsecondary education was being restructured rather than retrenched. Resources were not simply being cut back; they were being reallocated within the university while new resources were being concentrated on the same areas that were already rich in resources. Fields which were cut were generally those marked by low faculty pay, high student loads and high use of part-time or off-track labor (part-time faculty). These fields had a relatively high presence of women faculty, and the clientele of these fields had an unusually high proportion of women students.

Although there cannot be a direct cause-and-effect analysis of these conditions, Slaughter does note several interesting related insights. In the case of education, which was more deeply cut, these cuts came during the Reagan and Bush eras, which focused upon the ineptitude of educators. This was a decade of investigative "white papers" on the state of education, reflecting a "nation at risk" and an incompetent educational profession. Slaughter also noted that those fields which tended to survive and thrive with increased allocations from their institutions were those which were "productive." This new administrative lingo--"productive"--defined those fields which were "high tech" or high export and closely positioned to the current "market." In addition, those thriving faculty groups were closer to major mission agencies of the federal government such as DOD or DOE. These surviving academic groupings were more likely to have powerful external constituencies, highly paid career routings, or alumni who donated more significant monies to colleges and universities. In essence, the major retrenched fields reflected the more predominant presence of women and minorities; less external funding support; fewer higher-profile, wealthy alumni; and fewer power-base societal stakeholders.

In this illuminating article, Slaughter suggested that we should be concerned about the health and welfare of our colleges in this turbulent and changing higher education environment. I suggest that we should not have a concern for just the welfare of our own program. We are faced with a real threat concerning the lower class of citizenship and of "valuing" of the education, social service, and human-oriented professions in our universities and colleges.

Response to a New Future: The Case of UT-K's College of Education

As was suggested by Allan Quigley's introductory points, many colleges of education are in the midst of "strategic planning," "TQM," or other futuristic planning and improvement activities. In the case of our college, we also faced this desire to rethink our purpose and structure. The leaders for the effort have been Dean Richard Wisniewski, with the clear involvement and the at-times-disgruntled voices of the

faculty. Dick has been an advocate for making a difference within the college and within teacher education. He has noted that it is within our nature as a faculty to want inertia, sameness, routine. Yet we are facing a world where this calm and steady state has made us obsolete. He has presented a kindly critique and an advocacy for change. Our university and college are situated in a state with limited resources. As with many of you, we have faced a number of years with no salary increases and with an ongoing fragile discussion between legislature and university regarding the allocation of future resources. Yet our university has not suggested consideration of future reallocations; it has acted like a supportive family by attempting to maintain all services and activities with a bit less funding. I note this background because our desire to change has not come from imposed external threats or additional resources to support a new infrastructure.

For the last two years, with the support of funding from the Philip Morris Foundation, the college has engaged in an open process of faculty involvement, design, and discussion about our new future. Why should we care to do this rather difficult task? Our college is predomi-nantly tenured, with 40% of the faculty reaching retirement age in the next five years. In addition, the majority of our faculty have been members of the college for 20 or more years. With this sinecure of senior faculty, our college has not dramatically changed. As suggested by many people, we may have changed a few names of courses and programs, but we have maintained the same traditions and beliefs of the college since the 1950s. We also recognized that as we hired new faculty, they would also be embracing this 1950s structure and mentality. If we continue these structures and beliefs, we are less likely to identify innovative faculty. Many of us believe that now is the time to create and model this innovative spirit.

Beyond our own needs, Dick Wisniewski and others in our management team have been actively involved in other change efforts across the country. We are currently participating in at least seven other groupings, associations, or consortia of colleges of education who are actively pursuing particular new restructuring efforts. It is no longer defensible to <u>talk</u> change without <u>doing</u> change. This change, although predominantly focused upon teacher education, reflects a broader belief that our notions of education and the role of professional schools of education may be insufficient.

At Knoxville we are in the midst of planning the New College, our term for the outcomes of our deliberations. These activities represent the major discussions of goals and futures, the concerns and realities of setbacks, the cabals of special interest groups, the visionary voices who uplift us, and the struggles of any diverse groups of faculty who do not necessarily desire to change their lives as directed by others.

After approximately one year of discussion, debate, and research, one of the outcomes has been a publicly disseminated and faculty-voted document which outlines the college goals, the nature of a structure to redistribute the notions of academic programs, and the new or revised expectations placed upon ourselves as faculty in the college. No efforts were made to analyze past programs or faculty; rather, we focused upon a

new future. We identified support for five broad goals: leadership in education, innovation in instruction and technology, quality scholarship, collaboration with external constituencies, and a commitment to social justice and equity. This document and related planning process and goals represented the "grassroots of faculty, staff and students." The college truly attempted to involve all members of the community to create a life reflecting the new world. In reality, the current change movement of our college is toward those individuals and groups who are desiring to try new and innovative projects, programs, and duties. There are still programs and individuals who are stubbornly holding onto the old structures and attitudes (not desiring to venture out and try new things), holing themselves up in their old courses, programs and activities. As with any faculty group, we have seen a progression of thinking and support. At the time of the vote on the document, we had about 70% support by the faculty. Currently, I suspect we have 90% of the faculty who believe we cannot and should not turn back. Most of the faculty have supported this notion of change within the college; yet, as with any idiosyncratic group of people, there are still highly divergent beliefs about the process and the future outcomes.

There have been some lessons learned for us in adult education regarding restructuring and innovation of colleges of education. Our dean values adult education and believes it has a central role in any future in a college of education. In my conversations with Dick, he suggests three points for our consideration:

1) The vision of a college of education should reflect its service to adult learners. Because a college of education predominantly serves adults, adult education faculty should be at the center of these changes, modeling and guiding the college in our adult learning theory and philosophy to serve adult students.

2) We should not attempt to remain "pure" and isolated as a program; rather, we need to link and collaborate with other programs.

3) We need to create permeable rather than impermeable notions of our current programmatic efforts. We need to be in the middle of the action and become indispensable to the college. We need to get out of our collective "shells." As a pied piper for change within colleges of education, Dick suggests that collaboration and interdisciplinarity are more important functional structures than maintaining a "purity of program." He believes the desire to be isolated creates a greater likelihood of obsolescence and more limiting impact upon the college.

Status of the Adult Education Program: Lessons Learned

What has happened to the adult education program at UT-K during these efforts? Part of the focus should include my own movement from a faculty position to an associate dean's position. This movement has proven to create greater difficulties as well as, at times, offer us

additional insights into the process. [Lesson learned: Being in a college administrative structure does not necessarily make yours a favored program.] Secondly, because we (John Peters, Ralph Brockett, and I) have been viewed as solid scholars, excellent instructors, and good college citizens, we have been courted by various faculty groups. Our difficulty is both desiring to maintain the integrity of the adult education program and finding a compatible group of other colleagues who also reflect our diverse interests. [Lesson learned: There is no other program like us; therefore, we need to determine which groupings best meet our more dominant values and more compatible relations. We need to collaborate.] The three of us have found that each faculty member needs to be open and honest with colleagues and students; this candor is sometimes very difficult. [Lesson learned: The individuals and the functional program structure must have a stake in the placement and development of the program.] Lastly, each of us took on an active involvement and role in the college planning process. None of us sat by the sidelines and assumed the other two of us (or our other colleagues) would defend the program. [Lesson learned: Each person must be part of the change process.]

Suggestions from One Perspective

From these experiences, I would suggest that adult education programs should not assume that doing "usual business" will be sufficient. There are few protective pieces of armor which shield programs and persons from restructuring efforts. We know that large enrollment numbers in a program will not keep one from scrutiny. We know that faculty need to demonstrate solid citizenship and scholar-ship. And we know that the program needs to be a contributing member of the college. But beyond these givens, it is evident that each faculty member must engage in the college and university governance process. We need to make linkages and collaborations with other programs and activities, and we need to focus upon interdisciplinarity as an action.

From these reports and current panel points, I suggest that we need to assume that change--external/internal threats, as well as climate supports--will occur for each of us. We need to be ready with a set of actions which move beyond our own boundaries and which embrace the broader academic environment. I wish each of you good luck as "change masters" in your future!

D. Randy Garrison
Panelist
University of Calgary

U.S. Report

I believe the strength of the U.S. Report is its identification of areas of vulnerability. The specific areas and symptoms of possible vulnerability are well articulated. However, with regard to strategies for increasing support, we must keep in mind the stated caveat that distinctive circumstances will determine appropriate strategies.

It seems to me that the key issue to a successful graduate program is its faculty; that is, faculty who contribute to the knowledge base of the field and, as a consequence, are respected scholars both internally and externally. This will go a long way to attracting students, creating and maintaining relevant curriculum, and establishing the credibility and image to garner support from the senior administration.

The U.S. report identifies several strategies "to increase long term university support and cooperation." Consistent with the previous comment, the key one would appear to be leadership. Other strategies identified (quality, stakeholders, values) seem to follow from leadership. Through leadership we develop quality programs, establish stakeholders both internally and externally, and advocate values that are consistent with the field and the university. It is not a contradiction in terms to integrate with the university and develop quality adult education programs. In fact, there are many within the university who see the future potential of adult and continuing education and, to promote themselves, would be happy to make us expendable. On the other hand, they could become valuable allies. We must convince senior administration that adult educators have a key role to play. We cannot maintain an ivory tower attitude and approach to graduate studies.

Canadian Report/Strategies

Next, I turn to my particular situation. I will try to focus not upon our uniqueness but issues and strategies that may be generalizable. As alluded to previously, the overarching concern is the issue of integrating within the university community for purposes of identity and credibility. In addition, based upon the Canadian report, there are three categories of threats and strategies relevant to my situation. They are research, marginality and programming.

The first category, research, concerns the commitment and productivity to adult education as a field of study. In the long term I see this as our greatest threat. One concrete strategy we have adopted is to publish a *Research and Development Bulletin* primarily for internal consumption. This will identify various publications, presentations and news items associated with each faculty member. We believe that this has had a considerable effect in demonstrating our commitment to research. It not only publicizes our research efforts but encourages individual members to contribute to the field in their own way.

The second category, marginality, concerns adult education's "insularity from other academic units." A couple of modest strategies that we have focused upon are to serve on university committees and serve as adjunct appointments in other faculties and departments. More recently, we have begun to explore the idea of creating an interdisciplinary adult education group. This appears to have the support of graduate studies and would cut across traditional faculties and departments. I believe this has great potential in terms of integrating and supporting adult education within the university community.

The third category, programming, is concerned with quality issues. Programs must be innovative and relevant. Furthermore, to maintain the quality and credibility of such programs will necessitate faculty members who can work collaboratively for the ultimate viability of the program. There will be little margin for "dissension" and "ideological warfare" among faculty. To meet this challenge we have developed a new program specializing in learning in the workplace. This program has received recognition and support from senior administration. We believe we have demonstrated leadership and vision in positioning ourselves well within the university. On the down side, however, there will be several early retirements of key faculty members. This could put the program at risk. The chances are these people will not be replaced and then the question will arise as to whether we should continue with an adult education group.

Roger Hiemstra
Panelist
Syracuse University

I hope you will bear with me during my remarks, as they are likely to be laden with emotion at times. However, I suspect the experience of doing this will be somewhat of a cathartic if not healing process for me.

I actually think I was asked to be on this panel as an example of what not to do when we consider actions to take in times of retrenchment. So my remarks will be very much on the personal side as I describe what the past two years have been like.

For those of you who heard my remarks two years ago at the Montreal meeting, I said that I felt the Adult Education Program at Syracuse University would, like the Phoenix, rise again. As it turns out, a very effective Scud missile was just around the corner.

The Adult Education Program had been somewhat under attack since a new dean of Education was hired, beginning in the summer of 1990. We were having trouble helping him understand what adult education was really all about and it was clear that his priorities were in K-12 teacher education. He had been able to block our hiring replacements for two open tenure lines and we were struggling to keep everything going with a small faculty and by using adjuncts to teach several of the courses.

We all expected some major reorganization and had actually submitted a proposal in mid-1991 for a merger of Adult Education with other

programs. However, none of us was prepared for or had any indication of the dean's forthcoming action. The Adult Education Program had a long history of graduate training, had accomplished many outstanding achievements, was still involved in completing a $3.7 million Kellogg Foundation-sponsored project, had been responsible for another $1-plus million in other grants and new program dollars, and had more than 150 students, with nearly 30 more in the process of matriculation.

But in late October of 1991--just like that--the dean closed the Adult Education Program as well as three other units (although none of the others were stand-alone programs). He in essence withdrew all open tenure lines (two of which had been promised as part of the Kellogg Project), ceased the appointment of one person on a non-tenure track as of the coming May, and withdrew the tenure track from a person who would have come up for tenure the following year (*fired her* is a better way of saying it). I was tenured, so, in my view, he was unable to find a clear and legal way of letting me go. I suspect that he was really hoping I would get disgusted and leave so he could have another full professor's salary to redistribute. Perhaps this all sounds a little sour-grapish or paranoid in nature, but my few conversations with him and my subsequent raises (or lack thereof) since then have convinced me my suspicions were true.

The official reasons given for the closure (that we financially were not viable, did not have a large enough faculty base for a stand-alone program, etc.) were never shown to be accurate or substantial in comparison to other programs. In one of the few times I obtained an audience with the dean after his announcement, he finally told me it was "the luck of the draw" when I pressed for the real reasons for the closure. That may have been Las Vegas terminology meaning someone had to go (probably some truth there in terms of the reality of the situation), but more likely it was tied to both the real and perceived marginality of the adult education field.

Unfortunately, there was no recourse, no discussion, and my attempts to seek an audience with administrators higher up the chain were denied. The chancellor deferred me to the vice-chancellor, who deferred me back to the dean. The numerous letters, phone calls, and faxes coming from many of you and others from various locations went for naught, although I will forever be grateful for the support.

I know that the issue of marginality was a huge factor. I must take responsibility for not being able, with my colleagues' assistance, to help this dean understand what was adult education. But we certainly tried. The full faculty had been in three meetings with him prior to the closure to describe what we were doing, the nature of our research, etc. We probably should have picked up more on his lack of appreciation, as he made it clear he did not understand or appreciate our research foci and felt we should be doing different kinds of research. Alas, our antennae were not quite high enough.

What has it been like? I must say it has been and continues to be quite lonely. There are no adult education students other than the ones still finishing up and no adult education teaching colleagues other than our former faculty or adjuncts whom I occasionally see. I do see other adult education colleagues from the community periodically who are involved with our local adult education association and that certainly helps. But there is no more of what I can only call the "adult education

spirit" that I am sure many of you can recognize as being an important part of your programs. I perhaps feel saddest for the many people we could have reached in the future with our graduate program but now won't.

So if you sense a little melancholy or even bitterness in some of my comments, I trust you will understand. However, a couple of my colleagues here have urged me to be upbeat, and my spouse helps me to remain positive much of the time. Certainly I do have a job (unlike two of my former faculty colleagues, both of whom are women) and I do receive a paycheck. My new department, Instructional Design, Development, and Evaluation, has maintained six of the old Adult Education courses, so I have something to teach. I also am getting some additional time to write. In essence, the inevitable and inherently positive side of human nature has taken over much of my being and I am making it all work.

How do we make some sense out of all of this and what does it mean for many of your futures? Here are a few of my thoughts and ideas:

1) Be aware of the rapidity with which things can change. There was a history of relatively good support for adult education from previous deans. Of course lots of students, innovative programs off-campus, a very productive faculty (one year the six adult education faculty had almost twice the number of publications as the other 17 faculty in the division), and nearly five million dollars in new monies though grants and off-campus programs from 1980-1990 helped. But a new dean who enters the scene with a strong teacher-education thrust, no real understanding of adult education, no real appreciation of the off-campus effort, a feeling of "What have you done for me?" and no real sense of the program's history can change things quickly.

2) One thing that really surprised me was the lack of support from what I had considered to be good friends and colleagues across the School of Education. Only two of nearly 90 faculty outside of Adult Education said anything to me about the closing in the first couple of months after it happened. I know there was some heavy envy and even jealousy because of the large Kellogg Foundation grant we had received. There was always a problem of educating colleagues, especially K-12 professors, about the nature of the adult education field. I think, too, that some people simply did not know what to say or how to say it. But I suspect that a lot of it was "Thank goodness it wasn't my program," or what I would call a hunkering-down and protecting your own in tough times. A competition for scarce resources always has the possibility of mean-spirited or thoughtless actions.

3) One of my former Syracuse University colleagues has said publicly that my leadership style was in large part to blame for the program's demise. I found that comment to be hurtful, but in some respects I suspect there is some truth in it. In hindsight, I spent way too much time in program development--empire-building, some might say--and in internal efforts to bolster that "adult education spirit" I mentioned a few minutes ago. I did not spend very much time in building strong bridges and ties across the school and did not promote enough visibility for the program. The need to do that is described in the two presentations you just heard, but making your own mission clear across the school or college, and probably across the university, and integrating that mission within the school's general mission (as the University of

Wyoming has done) are very important. I think I relied far too much on the assumption that good works by themselves would earn widespread respect.

4) How can you prepare yourselves for a strong attack on your program? Perhaps one of the things you can do is have in place a "care-and-feeding-of-the-dean" program that can be quickly implemented. Things such as having the dean meet all faculty, meet some students, meet some alumni, etc., might help. Have some facts and figures ready that show the program's contributions to the university, community, and national professions. Describe the types of positions graduates are occupying.

There is not much additional advice I can really offer in terms of a positive strategy for strengthening your program ahead of crisis times other than what many of you are probably already doing. I am probably the last person to be offering advice because I certainly did not do the right things. We thought we <u>were</u> doing all the right things. However, when there is a strong attack, a threatened reorganization, or a change that unexpectedly puts you under some administrator with whom you have difficulties working, I think there is no real way of predicting the impact it will have on you or how debilitating it might become in terms of your raising a defense or obtaining outside support.

For me it was very debilitating. Because it happened so fast and so unexpectedly and because I had, at least in my own perception, devoted so much of myself to building the Adult Education Program at Syracuse University (at the expense of other things that I now realize are much more important), the announced closure of the program put me into a tremendous tailspin for about three weeks. My health--physically, emotionally, and psychologically--deteriorated to a level that I had never reached before and hope I never reach again. In essence, I "bugged out." I will never forgive this dean for the agony he put me and my family through.

Fortunately, my family and some very good friends, a couple of whom are in this room tonight, pulled me through. The point is that how you will react in such a situation is probably an unknown that you may not be able to adequately prepare for, and it may really debilitate you in terms of making all the necessary responses. Perhaps hearing my story and some of the others like it can help you at least think ahead of time about possible responses and backup plans.

As Burt Sisco said, we must make this whole area of discussion lead to a renewed way of thinking about our role, our missions, and even our paradigms. I think these papers, this session tonight, and the deliberations throughout this CPAE meeting will be very important in helping us build our own successful futures.

Life at the Margins:
Post-Conference Reflections on the Opening Panel

B. Allan Quigley
Penn State University

Summer 1994

In a thoughtful article which examines how institutions of higher education are experiencing retrenchment and restructuring and how those phenomena are impacting decisions on campuses today, Slaughter (1993) concludes:

> [Across AAUP institutions of higher education] those fields able to position themselves close to the market and locate themselves in broad political discourse on productivity were generally not cut, whereas those that were unwilling or unable to participate in the discourse of the market, productivity, and competitiveness were cut. The relation of various fields to the market was socially constructed, although within firm political boundaries. . . . The faculty and fields that were successful were usually those associated with established external funding structures or with careers outside the university that were able to command high salaries. The fields that were cut became 'have-not' fields within the university. They were generally fields marked by low faculty pay, high student loads, at least after 1984, and high use of part-time or off-track labor (p. 276).

Slaughter also notes, "The University of Oregon cut most of its School of Education, although enrollments were high and job prospects strong" (p. 277). Her analysis is that the student numbers in programs are not as important as the economic "routes to social mobility" (p. 278) which academic programs are able to provide their graduates. Further, she argues that a program's political ability to convince its institutions that it is indeed linked to important markets beyond the university structure is vital for program survival and growth.

It is in this same context that Slaughter discusses the difficulties experienced by women in higher education. Gumport (1993), writing in the same dedicated issue of *The Journal of Higher Education*, takes the same line of discussion to the typically weak role colleges of education find themselves in the 1990s.

This growing body of high education literature and the attendant discourse are vital to the future of graduate adult education. However, we need to go beyond this to create our own knowledge base for our own sets of issues. We need to ask, for instance, whether Slaughter's and Gumport's findings--if accepted--can be generalized to our own field. Are decisions made on the basis of "social mobility" with respect to our field from within our colleges? If they are, how well are we positioned relative to Slaughter's thesis? If her conclusions are either not acceptable or not applicable to our adult education graduate programs, there is even greater urgency to ask how long we can continue to separate our programs from the pressures being placed on our colleges and the pressures of the regular school-education programs around us.

The relationship of higher education to our fate within the education context on campus is the emerging question for our Commission.

To the extent that the field of adult education has collectively discussed its role and its influence--or lack of both--on today's post-modern university campuses has mainly been a discussion occurring within, or under the auspices of, the Commission of Professors of Adult Education (CPAE). The CPAE has been the primary focal point for considering the issues around our future in academe. This report attempts to both document and further that discussion.

Events Leading Up to the 1993 CPAE Conference

It is not clear when the discipline of adult education was first termed "marginal." It is as if adult education has always been given and, in turn, has always embraced marginalization as part of its daily condition and very identity. It is probably safe to say that the academic community has looked upon adult education as a "newcomer" since its first appearance on the university campus in the 1930s. Certainly adult education academics--more than anyone else--have made a distinct point of referring to our field as being marginalized. And there is little question that we have used the label as something of a badge of honor to "distinguish" our field--that is, to set it apart from the regular school discipline on our campuses and in the field of education. Our task has been to define--goes this line of reasoning--even if it has meant doing so in oppositional terms rather than collaborative ways.

It would be a mistake, however, to assume that the CPAE has been silent on adult education's status as a field on the campuses of higher education through the years. The state of adult education has been a clear leitmotif for years in the Commission, but the issue of actually strategizing for the building of support for our programs was a topic specifically addressed for the first time in a CPAE-sponsored report by Alan Knox in 1973. Ironically, that report focused on how to gain support when the pressure of the day was for universities to rapidly *establish* adult programs, often on "soft money."

With the decline of the economy and rising threats to adult education graduate programs through the 1980s and 1990s, a panel of professors from the U.S., Canada, and New Zealand was asked to speak at the 1991 CPAE meeting in Montreal. Their theme was to be innovations and redirections that programs were now making. However, the tone was less than "innovative," because it was at this conference that panelist Roger Hiemstra reported his fears for the closure of the Syracuse University Adult Education Program (see Flannery, 1991).

As more and more programs came under threat of large or small cuts to faculty, the topic of "program change" was taken by the CPAE's Executive Committee into two lines of investigation. Start-up activities were initiated at the 1992 annual meeting in Anaheim: Alan Knox and a committee of professors in the U.S., and a second committee in Canada, chaired by Tom Sork and Budd Hall, were asked to work during the 1992-93 year to (a) survey and report on the issues facing adult education as a field of graduate study and (b) collect possible strategies from the field for addressing these threats.

The 1993 CPAE conference in Dallas was built around the efforts of these two committees. Copies of both the "Knox report" (Knox, 1993),

concerning U.S. programs, and the "Sork report" (Sork, with Budd Hall, 1993), concerning western Canada, were available for conference participants. Copies of the Knox report had also been sent to the membership earlier in the year by Commission Chair Ralph Brockett.

Knox and Sork opened the first general session at the Dallas conference by giving overviews of their respective committees' work and findings. The overviews were followed by a reaction panel: five individuals' reflections on the issues and on strategies to consider.

Purposes of This Report

An earlier version of my present report was intended as a companion to the Knox and Sork/Hall reports. It was mailed to the CPAE membership in mid-1994, re-introducing the panelists via their written remarks and including data from the Knox group's interviews with a set of strategies compiled by participants at the Dallas CPAE meeting. Both the first version and this one aim to give a clearer articulation of the issues facing our field from a range of faculty and administrative perspectives, and to provide strategies faculty may use. Below, I briefly summarize the panelists' remarks and again call attention to the value of the Knox interview data (see appendix) and the collection of strategies.

Looking back on the 1993 opening panel, I believe even more strongly that the idea of marginalization is absolutely central to an understanding of the issues facing graduate adult education. When I, as chair, began that opening session (whose theme was "The Future of Adult Education in Academe"), I asked the audience to indicate how many had been involved over the past year and a half in strategic planning, TQM, CQI, and/or benchmarking. To every question, from a third to half of the audience gave a show of hands. Next, from a quarter to a third of the audience raised their hands when I asked how many had been involved in restructuring and/or "reorganizing" their faculty; how many had been involved in the loss of one or more faculty positions (as the result of, for example, retirement); and how many had been at risk of losing their entire program over the past 18 months. Finally, when I asked how many in the audience had feared for their entire programs and/or jobs as professors of adult education over the past 18 months, 10 to 15 hands in the room went up.

The five panelists who spoke after this questioning period gave both personal and data-based papers (see prior sections in these *Proceedings*). First, Rosemary Caffarella argued that the "empirical debate" which so often drives the decisions upon which programs either flourish or become the have-nots on campus is a highly deceptive and entirely frustrating one. This "discourse," as Slaughter (1993) terms it, is actually a raw, emotional battle for survival. It is being waged by career academics--the masters of surface dispassion. The "logical discourse," according to Caffarella, is draining and potentially dangerous, but the potential consequences of avoiding the debate are even worse.

Burt Sisco argued for taking a more realistic look at where we are as faculty in the university structure, and asked us to begin to tell a much better and more forceful story. He argued that we live at the margins because, in part, we choose to be there. Burt gave us a list of recommendations for the field out of his own faculty's experience at the University of Wyoming and out of his own observations in the field.

Carol Kasworm presented her perspectives both as an adult education faculty member and as someone who has worked in leadership positions at the University of Tennessee-Knoxville. Hers was a look through the eyes of deans--particularly in colleges of education--and of higher education administrators. She discussed how deans are talking at a national level about ways to restructure their colleges of education in these difficult economic times. She described UT-K's experience as the adult education faculty became part of a restructuring process over the previous year. She also gave us suggestions based on "lessons learned."

Randy Garrison, from the University of Calgary, reported on the circumstances found in Canada on the same sets of issues. He responded to the Sork/Hall report, then discussed some strategies which have met with some success in Canada. These have continuing potential for the future in both the U.S. and Canada.

Finally, Roger Hiemstra related the story of the demise of the graduate Adult Education Program at Syracuse University, formerly one of the most distinguished programs in the U.S. He presented and interpreted events leading up to the closure of that program, explaining what faculty did during the closure process to try to reverse decisions. He reflected on what it meant to him personally as former head of that program, and gave his thoughts and advice to the wider field.

All five of these presenters made personal disclosures. All five spoke directly to the question of where we are headed as a field. All five said *we need to change the way we function on our campuses.*

On the second day of the 1993 CPAE conference, participants (professors, graduate students, and other interested attendees) formed groups to discuss the issues facing the field and to compile strategies for addressing those issues in the coming years. (That compilation is a supplement to this report. It contains the best thinking of approximately 60 professors and students of adult education who participated in the half-day activity.)

Taken as a whole, my quizzing the audience and introducing the opening panel; the Knox and Sork overviews; the five panel presentations; and this, my "looking-back" report have given voice to a range of faculty, administrators and students across U.S. and Canadian adult education graduate programs on what some in our field consider to be the most important issue facing our field today.

(Interestingly, a contrasting and noteworthy comment made on the last day of the conference came from Bill Griffith of the University of British Columbia: He said it was not so very long ago that there were barely enough professors of adult education around to constitute a Commission, never mind have a discussion on "threats to the field." He reminded the plenary that we have never had a stronger field--if looked at from the longer perspective--and that we have been under threat many times before.)

Irrespective of how the perceptions and facts in the several reports are interpreted, it will be widely agreed that graduate adult education programs on campuses across the U.S. and Canada are part of a volatile discussion on the future of higher education. Whether we grow and flourish as a discipline or move from marginality to slow extinction will be in large part dependent on how the field conceptualizes,

verifies, interprets, and responds to the "realities" on our campuses over the next decade. It is in this spirit of inquiry that I have developed and made available this report and its attachments.

References

Flannery, D. (Ed.). (1991). *Proceedings of the 1991 Annual Conference, Commission of Professors of Adult Education*, Montreal, Que., October 13-15. Harrisburg, PA: Penn State University-Harrisburg.

Gumport, P. (1993). The contested terrain of academic program reduction. *The Journal of Higher Education, 64*(3), 282-311.

Knox, A. (1973). *Development of adult education graduate programs*. Washington: CPAE/AEA of the USA.

Knox, A., Caffarella, R., Courtenay, B., Deshler, D., and Ross-Gordon, J. (1993). *Strengthening university support for adult education graduate programs; a report to members of the Commission of Professors of Adult Education.* Madison: University of Wisconsin, Department of Continuing, Adult, and Vocational Education (CAVE).

Quigley, A. (1994, Spring). *Benchmark interview schedule, Adult Education faculty*. Monroeville, PA: Pennsylvania State University, Adult Education Program.

Slaughter, S. (1993). Retrenchment in the 1980s: The politics of prestige and gender. *The Journal of Higher Education, 64*(3), 250-282.

Sork, T. (1993). *Strengthening university support for adult education graduate programs: Western Canada perspectives.* [A report prepared for the] Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Education (CASAE) and the Commission of Professors of Adult Education (CPAE). Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

****

Compilation of Strategies Contributed by the Participants in the 1993 CPAE Annual Conference

I. What can we do in our own adult education programs and departments?

A. Overall:

--reduce emphasis on adult education as a separate domain
--resist tendencies toward isolation (superior attitude)
--change elitist oppositional attitudes toward other educators
--emphasize relevance to teacher training
--limit use of adjunct faculty (makes cancelling program easy)
--conduct collaborative research
--engage in team teaching
--invite administrators into classes and use their expertise
--encourage students to be vocal, supportive of program with other faculty

--conduct systematic socialization of new faculty members
--help new faculty become visible, politically "street smart"
--appoint faculty to governance positions and help them become promoted
--involve new faculty on teams
--consider the size of admissions in relationship to quality

B. Teaching and advising:

--increase the number of students (within reasonable limits of "quality") and stature of students
--improve quality of courses which model and teach principles of up-to-date theory. Courses can market the program.
--increase academic advising--its quality and scope--to encompass mentoring and help students develop professionally
--recognize link between effective teaching at graduate level and effective advising (beyond negotiating "hoops"). Teaching and advising are inseparable at graduate level; implement this and model for other faculty.

C. Research:

--increase visibility of research
--increase quality and quantity of research by
  --focusing on high-profile problems
  --building coalitions/teams to pursue research grants
  --developing research proposals which enable us to balance other program responsibilities (*i. e.*, by getting enough help to conserve our own time)
  --identifying what's important to the institution
  --paying attention to implications of buy-out

D. Mentoring and team-building:

--mentor new faculty in the "hoops" (process) of academia
--become part of community, both locally and nationally
--identify core values
--take the moral "high ground"
--build a cross-program task force
--engage in strategic planning
--recognize that we work with *people*; attend to feelings, convey respect
--confront individual "egos" in programs: Promote understanding of implications of lack of collaboration on program; deal with issues of individual power and control (compare to collective power and control).

II. What can we do within our colleges?

--advise "critical mass" of capable students into others' classes
--be speakers/players in K-12 mission of colleges, in
  --teacher staff development
  --parent and community education/involvement
  --lifelong learning for non-college-bound (articulation)
  --teacher education (*e. g.*, methods classes, portfolio assessment)
--stop "beating up" on primary and secondary education; update personal knowledge of K-12 change/reform

--examine the field's rhetoric--the lifelong learning vs. education position
--within lifelong learning emphasis, be specialists in adult (development) age range, but coalesce with other educators' missions, including educational reform
--market self and program by various methods, such as
  --building coalitions
  --exemplifying adult education by what we say and how we act
--push adult education faculty into department-head, associate-dean positions; accept administration leadership
--engage in environmental scanning
--become collaborative and inclusive
--provide courses for K-12 teachers on adult learners, especially as related to working with parents
--participate on search committees for new deans
--reconsider our adult education language and how it communicates beyond our programs
--educate faculty in the college about the nature and scope of our efforts
--marshall support from alumni
--become a resource to the college/campus
--work to develop programs that are "friendly" (in curricula, residency requirements, etc.) to adult learners

III. What can we do on our campuses?

--watch for opportunities to forge alliances/relationships with other adult educators on campus
--work with instructional improvement efforts on campus--faculty development, adjunct faculty development, teaching assistant development
--serve on faculty governance bodies in important roles; be sure people know where we come from
--serve on research groups, in centers and institutes, including African American studies, ethnic studies, women's studies
--participate in interdisciplinary academic programs
--serve on graduate committees with faculty from other colleges
--offer high-quality courses which will attract students from other areas on campus
--design programs to feature appropriate balance between intra- and inter-departmental aspects
--encourage minors outside the college
--offer "service" courses in college teaching; they're invaluable
--promote the adult education program through interdisciplinary alliances
--bring in visiting scholars
--forge linkages with other university faculty through adult education student contacts
--help the university deal with problems of freshman retention
--use university publications to give visibility to the program
--join with the university in addressing attacks on higher education
--provide education to teaching assistants across the university
--provide instructional improvement opportunities for faculty
--seek membership on state task forces dealing with educational policies
--co-author publications with influentials
--consider developing two-year and B.A. programs in, for example,

HRD with the business school or as sub-majors in other departments

IV. What can we do at the external-organization level?

--form external advisory boards
--join interdisciplinary teams to address high-priority social issues and public policies
--have an advisory council for the adult education program, to build alliances with, for example, employers
--provide service to local/state/regional adult education professionals (*e. g.*, in summer institutes)
--be involved with professional groups in areas other than adult education--*e. g.*, AERA, NASPA, NACADA (higher-education advising)
--publish in journals in related fields; find ways to connect the purpose/rationale of this effort to entire promotion of program
--use practica and internships to build liaisons

V. What can we do at the Commission of Professors (CPAE) level?

--establish Internet linkages
--provide program profiles to show what's happening with our programs
--emphasize interest connections
--view ourselves historically
--organize a deliberate presence at AERA to facilitate recognition of adult education as part of educational research
--network on an ongoing basis to assist in weathering storms and negotiating the campus environment
--develop a "template" for assessing/restoring program vitality (*e. g.*, develop/share models for the annual unit merit review)
--by networking or other approaches, assist faculty in accessing information on funding opportunities
--influence accreditation bodies (*e. g.*, NCATE) about importance of adult education; consider adding accreditation to our field
--develop alternative forms of assistance; not all forms will be welcome in all departments
--develop fact sheets, inventories of programs, studies of the relationship of adult education to other programs, etc.
--develop strategies to encourage adult education programs to support one another
--create formal networks to encourage joint efforts such as corporate degree programs and teaching exchanges
--communicate the diverse ideologies/missions of adult education graduate programs; acknowledge diversity
--as a commission, encourage and provide guidance to programs in clarifying mission, philosophy, focus, etc.
--explore the role of adult education within the college of education: What are some natural and not-so-natural connections and relationships?
--seek intellectual/theoretical connections; highlight models and examples of such connections
--articulate an emergency response process
--use e-mail to alert members of problems and other needs for support
--investigate other means of communication

Our Past, New Visions, New Directions: Framing the Closing Panel

Brad Courtenay
University of Georgia

We have spent a considerable amount of time discussing the survival of this "family," the Commission of Professors of Adult Education. We have discovered those factors that foster survival and those that contribute to the undoing of a family. In all, we have concluded that the family will survive and, therefore, perhaps we need to direct our thinking to the future. This session has been planned to do just that. Often in families it is the younger generation that helps the family realize new opportunities and the need for change. To that end we have asked a few "younger" faculty members--younger at least in terms of professorial experience--to comment on challenges and opportunities that should be of serious concern to members of the CPAE. I will introduce them in the order of their presentation: Dr. Vanessa Sheared, San Francisco State University; Dr. David Hemphill, San Francisco State University; Dr. Fred Schied, Pennsylvania State University; and Dr. Talmadge Guy, University of Georgia.

Vanessa Sheared
Panelist
San Francisco State University

Alternative Ways of Addressing Change in Adult Education: An Engagement in Polyryhthmic Discourse

Change seems to be an inevitable fact in our lives: We change careers, homes, lifestyles, appearances, and our ideas. In some instances these changes occur because of shifts or trends in society. In other instances they may occur because of personal transformations in our lives. Often they occur because we need some variety. Whether the change is initiated by some internal or external force, it often creates problems and tensions and/or induces stress in our lives, which complicates our ability to rationally resolve conflict.

Our general reaction to tension or stress is to decrease it through some logical and rational method. This linear approach is generally structured and planned--so much so that the plans are usually backed up with additional plans, all aimed at resolving the problem or decreasing the tension or stress. We are, after all, rational and intelligent beings.

When our well-thought-out plans fail to eliminate the problem or reduce the stress, we do generally do one of two things: We either look inward and search for new, well-thought-out plans or we begin to examine and analyze external, discernible and visible factors. We believe that if we are consistent and diligent we can resolve or conquer any problem as well as eliminate any tension or stress in our life.

We fail to realize that there are some problems that cannot be resolved by well-thought-out, rational, objective measures. They cannot be resolved by these measures because the reasons for the problems are themselves not well thought out, rational or objective. Our assumption is that everything is linear and objective, when in fact there is a subjective way of knowing and responding to internal and external change.

Throughout this conference, adult educators have discussed changes occurring in their universities, their colleges, and their departments. We have discovered that many adult education programs had been reorganized because there was a better "fit" to be made with some other entity within the institution. Departments and programs had in some cases been eliminated because, they were told, "This has to be done in order to save money" or, "Your enrollments are too low." On the surface these changes seemed rather necessary and logical--that is, until we began to see that other departments were expanding and both administrative salaries and student tuition were increasing. Moreover, we realized that adult education programs were in the direct line of fire--for being down-sized and cut back while other programs seemed to be thriving! The response to these changes has been to apply linear, rational solutions.

We believe that if we develop an overall mission statement, engage in marketing our programs more effectively and efficiently, get our colleagues to write support letters for our program, and rethink our overall definition and purpose, our efforts will somehow make a difference. In some cases they do, but more often when the die has been cast there is very little that can be done to change things.

My goal is not to paint a grim picture, but rather to suggest that sometimes our rational and logical efforts fail. They are unsuccessful because we have failed to challenge the very basis upon which these changes are actually occurring. We assume that the reasons given are, in fact, rational and logical. We further assume that others have "a best interest" in mind. Finally, we assume that if they only knew what the "real situation" was, they would not employ changes.

A Case in Point

We have a welfare system in this country that provides monetary and non-monetary assistance to those in need. We are currently seeking ways to reform this system because many people are taking advantage of it. There is a generation of welfare moms and babies, there is a budget crisis, people are lazy and don't want to work, our economy cannot continue caring for these babies that are born out of wedlock: These are just a few of the reasons we have been given for needing welfare reform.

Programs such as the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Program (JOBS) have been put into place. JOBS is designed to provide people, women in particular, with an opportunity either to work or to go to school. They must become self-sufficient. They must become examples for their children. The way to do these things is to work or go to school.

Many of these people in fact are in our adult basic education programs, where adult educators are attempting to serve them. The adult student participates because she or he must. Adult educators are told that if the adult students get off welfare, our economy will not be drained, values will be restored, and we as a nation will be able to compete in the global marketplace.

Buzz words such as *self-sufficiency, restoration of values, competition in the marketplace, best fit, low participation or no participation,* and *budget crisis* are just a sample of the terms used by irrational ideologues promoting irrational change. They are irrational because the solutions applied to them fail to produce the outcomes projected. Whether you are on welfare or you are an adult education professor undergoing irrational and/or unreasonable change, your rational solutions are likely to fail.

Why do I Present You with this Case?

Adults receiving public assistance are told, just as many of us are told, that change is necessary. Change is necessary because it will create a more efficient economy, values, and a better fit. We rarely think about irrationality in cases like this, because what we are told all makes sense: We have a problem, so we apply rational solutions.

However, these rational solutions have failed to take under consideration one critical question or issue. For folk on welfare the critical question is a two-part one: "Who deserves to receive welfare?" Do *you* deserve to receive welfare? The answer to the first question in 1938 was, "You deserve welfare assistance if your spouse has died or your spouse was mentally or physically disabled." If these are non-existent factors, then the answer is no. If the answer is no, then the solutions applied may or may not work. Currently, education and work have been used as solutions for the problems of people receiving public assistance. However, if it takes the person too long to acquire that education or employment, then the solution is deemed a failure. The solution then fails because the people who are receiving welfare do not deserve it. Thus they are marginal and failures.

The educational system marginalizes the adult student even further by attempting to educate her or him on false premises. In fact, *marginalization* refers to the silencing of individuals through the construction by the dominant culture of legislation and policies which "commatize" them while negating their political, economic, and historical claims to equity and equality. The following characteristics can be ascribed to marginalization:

> Individuality is co-opted or obfuscated. People give up that which is unique to who they are and take on the characteristics of the dominant other.
>
> Appropriate resources cannot be given to that which does not have meaning or does not exist.
>
> Without resources or a voice in the decisions that are made, marginalized people's needs and concerns will not be entered into the discourse of change.
>
> Marginalization excludes women's and "others'" knowledge and understanding.
>
> The historical uniqueness of the individual is forfeited in favor of a larger good. Factors that contribute to an understanding of the individual are diffused among many other factors (Sheared 1992).

When you are marginalized, your uniqueness does not matter. Resources cannot be given to something that does not exist or has no meaning. If you have no meaning, then you do not have a voice. Without a voice, your story cannot be told, so your needs are forfeited for the larger good. Women on welfare suffer from this. . . and so do adult education programs that are being terminated.

Same Question, Different Target

For adult educators whose programs are undergoing changes or being terminated we must redress the question, "What is the critical issue?" We must ask, "Are the changes necessary for the reasons given, or are there some other political, socioeconomic, or historical *truths* that you are unaware of?"

Whether we have Ph.Ds, Ed.Ds, or no degree, our response to irrational problems has been to resolve them with rational and logical plans and ideas. My challenge to us as adult educators faced with changes in our profession, our universities (or wherever we are), and our classrooms is that we begin to re-examine ways in which we approach change. The questions we must ask ourselves are: "Is the answer in the people that we serve--are they perceived as marginal?" "How are our programs viewed by mainstream educators?" "Are programs which are aimed at serving marginalized groups viewed very highly in the institutional structures where we teach or work?"

There is a need to find out why and what changes need to be made. Are there some political, historical, or social truths that we are overlooking? We need to stop applying rational solutions to irrational ideas, plans, and behaviors if we are to succeed in developing adult education programs that meet the needs of adult students. We need to examine program changes from a different standpoint, including the perspectives of others' ways of knowing.

The Africentric feminist or womanist standpoint is one way to approach change. This perspective allows us to use a non-Western and non-linear view of the world and reality. It requires that we acknowledge our *polyryhthmic reality*. Polyryhthmic realties as senses of knowing are reflected in African American art, language, music and dance. Barkley-Brown (1988) describes this as a movement through one's multiple realities and understandings: "People and actions do move in multiple directions at once. If we analyze these people and actions by linear models, we will create dichotomies, ambiguities, cognitive dissonance, disorientation, and confusion in places where none exist" (pp.17-18)

Changes that acknowledge polyrhythmic realities offer us a way to assess our motives and our reactions. As adult educators responsible for educating and training others, we must seek alternative ways of addressing societal and personal changes.

The 21st century will provide many changes in our field and in society. The copious changes in technology, demography, the workforce, and society require adult educators to use alternative approaches to problem resolution. Linear models have not yet been successful in addressing diversity within adult education programs. A shift in paradigm becomes inevitable if we are to make progress toward building new structures that are inclusive of other ways of knowing.

References

Barkley-Brown, E. (1990). African-American women's quilting: A framework for conceptualizing and teaching African-American women's history. In M. Malson, E. Mudimbe-Boyi, J. O'Barr & M. Wyer (Eds.), *Black women in America* (pp. 9-18). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sheared, V. (1992). *From workfare to edfare: African American women and the elusive quest for self-determination.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Leadership and Educational Policy Studies, Northern Illinois University.

David F. Hemphill

Panelist

San Francisco State University

Seven "Excellent Ideas" for Rebuilding the Intellectual Vitality of Adult Education

These remarks may best be interpreted with an understanding of the context of my own experience as an adult educator. I have worked in adult education in Northern California for 18 years, first as a classroom teacher in community-based immigrant education programs, then as a program director, and, for the past eight years, as a professor. My doctoral study emphasized phenomenology and critical theory, as there are no adult education doctoral programs in California. I have thus constructed an understanding of adult education from a background as a practitioner, informed by perspectives of critical social theory.

I have frequently felt out of the "mainstream" of adult education theory as it is conceived and espoused by AAACE. I have lived and worked in a particular adult education reality which is intensely multicultural. Periodic reference to Jossey-Bass tomes on "how to be an adult educator" has not often been helpful. I have begun to wonder where the mainstream of adult education lives (not near me). Perhaps this mainstream needs redirection or deconstruction.

Like many colleagues, much of my attention in recent years has been claimed by program survival and university politics. As a result, the graduate program in Adult Education at San Francisco State University remains viable, having filled a vacancy left by a retiring colleague. We still exist, we hope to innovate and grow, but we remain extremely vulnerable.

In the midst of our discussions of organizational survival, however, we must not forget that the strength of a discipline such as adult education rests as much upon its intellectual vitality as its organizational viability. Given my own perplexity noted with respect to the intellectual frameworks of the field of adult education, I welcome the opportunity to suggest some intellectual directions the field might pursue. I offer herewith *Dave's Seven Excellent Ideas for Building the Intellectual Vitalityof the field of Adult Education.*

Idea 1:
Build on the Field's Strengths in Participatory and Qualitative Research

We need to build on our field's demonstrated strengths and important innovations. There are many, but one that comes to mind is our initial leadership in alternative research methodologies, specifically participatory research and qualitative research. Although my doctoral study had no adult education focus, imagine my surprise when I received research training in participatory research--training which was largely based on the work of Budd Hall (1978), an adult educator. More recently I have found Sharan Merriam's work (1988) on case study research to be most helpful in training graduate students. Our field can, therefore, lay legitimate claim to some important innovations in a growing and promising area. Why don't we do so and become more active in building on these strengths?

Idea 2:
Continue to Reconstruct the Social Purpose of Adult Education

In recent years in North America, we have seen an important movement to reclaim or reconstruct the social purpose of adult education, which, some argue, became lost or obfuscated after World War II. The North American Popular Educators is an example of this reclamation effort. We should support the continuation of this effort, but I wonder if it is possible to do it in such a way that is somehow more inclusive of--and intelligible to--the large numbers of adult education workers in the "mainstream" public-education delivery system: the community colleges and adult schools. Many everyday classroom teachers with whom I work find it hard to see immediately the relevance of Eduard Lindeman (1926), Paulo Freire (1972), Stephen Brookfield (1987), and Jack Mezirow (1991). We must work to make this social purpose and the sociocultural context of adult education more accessible and comprehensible to those who otherwise construct adult education as primarily a technical knowledge or skill-transmission project.

Idea 3:
Continue to Engage Literacy Issues

Many of us have been active in the area of adult literacy. There are now important emergent literacy program contexts such as family, workplace, homeless, ESL, and mother-tongue literacy. Have we been sufficiently active in this critical, high-visibility national policy issue, or has it been taken away from us? Do our graduate programs have an available emphasis or coursework in adult literacy? None of our adult education programs was able to bid successfully on the National Center for Research on Adult Literacy several years ago. What is our current role in the Center?

I am concerned that we may have contributed to a debate on adult literacy that has become dichotomized and unconstructive: At one end we have the functional context, competency-based perspective, and on the other we have the participatory, community-based perspective. As one who has had to negotiate back and forth between these perspectives, I (and many practitioners) would like to see a less polarized, more multipolar debate. Some proponents (the functional context adherents) probably need to deepen their consideration of theoretical/philosophical issues, while others (the participatory, community-based wing) probably need to deepen their consideration of technical/practical issues. Furthermore, the dis-

cussions of adult literacy need to become more inclusive of ESL and bilingual perspectives, and should be broadened to include media literacy.

Idea 4:
Further Engage Multicultural and Feminist Discourses

We need to open up our thinking on many levels with respect to the influences of culture, gender and other dimensions of diversity on adult learning and adult education. We must reflect seriously upon how the growth and diversity of cultural perspectives may call into question--and cause us to modify--long-held presumptions as no longer universal. These may include stage theories of adult development, adult motivations for learning, self-directed learning, and the very notion of critical thinking. We must understand culture and cultural influences as forces derived from and expressed through national origin, race, language, gender, and sexual orientation. Such useful constructs as "cultural hegemony" must become our friends. We must begin to understand that many of the received truths of our discipline are not cultural universals; rather, they are reflective of specific sociohistorical and cultural contexts.

An important example--though only one--of the sort of cultural expansion we need is beginning to emerge in the discourses of our colleagues Betty Hayes, Annie Brooks, Rosemary Cafarella, Carol Kasworm, and others who are giving voice to gender perspectives in our field. But this should not be solely their responsibility by reason of their gender. We all need to educate ourselves with respect to the powerful critiques and theoretical frameworks emerging from work in feminist pedagogy conducted by such researchers as Carmen Luke (1992), Jennifer Gore (1993), and Elizabeth Ellsworth (1989). Culture, then, broadly constructed, becomes a critical avenue for investigation and practice in adult education.

Idea 5:
Expand the Theory Base to Include Postmodernist Discourses

Our field of theory and practice necessarily rests on some underlying, sometimes conflicting theoretical and philosophical frameworks: behaviorism, humanism, cognitivism, social phenomenology, and critical theory, among others. As an applied, interdisciplinary field we clearly have been--and should be--influenced by intellectual debates in the humanities and social sciences. Why, then, are we not doing more to integrate into our own thinking understandings of postmodernist discourses? Such discourses are no longer even particularly new in the humanities or social sciences.

The works of Jean-Francois Lyotard (1989), Michel Foucault (1972), Jean Baudrillard (1988), Fredric Jameson (1991), Stephen Toulmin (1990), and others have much to offer us in interpreting shifting contemporary contexts of adult learn-ing and education, in which identity, power, agency, media, technology, and language are all interacting in new ways that do not conform to the modernist paradigms we have employed to date. We can no longer afford to be put off by the largely impenetrable language of postmodern theorists. To do so deprives us of important constructs such as the notion of a dominant, invisible cultural power center to which marginalized, multi-ple "others" are subordinated in a multicultural society. To do so also deprives us of Lyotard's powerful notion of "incredulity toward meta-narratives," which argues for a

healthy skepticism toward any universa-bilizable theoretical explanations, to include Jurgen Habermas' (1984) universal communicative rationality, upon which much of Jack Mezirow's (1991) important work has been based.

In sum, we can no longer afford to see an important area of intellectual discourse as being the work of "those weird, hard-to-understand French guys that they teach about in literature courses." We have to make sense of them for ourselves and for our students.

Idea 6:
Expand on Work in Situated Adult Cognition

There is some very promising work going on in an area variously known as "everyday cognition," "situated cognition," or "practical intelligence." A lot of us probably read and make use of the Vygotsky-influenced, constructivist work of people such as Jean Lave (1988, 1991), Robert Sternberg (1986), Barbara Rogoff (1984), Howard Gardner (1983), Sylvia Scribner and Michael Cole (1981), and others. We need more discussion of this interesting work in our literature. Lave (1991), for example, has a new work on the contexts of informal learning among adults, where she proposes a new theory of social adult learning called "legitimate peripheral participation." We should begin to integrate this into our work and teaching.

These researchers and others are employing diverse qualitative and quantitative methodologies to conduct convincing empirical investigations of how adults acquire, use, and transfer cognitive skills and knowledge in specific everyday contexts. This is important new knowledge for us which, if better understood and disseminated, could open up important debates for our field.

Idea 7:
Seriously Investigate Evolving Technologies and Adult Learning

In many parts of North America--certainly in my own region--adult education programs are buying into new technologies on a wholesale basis. We see the massive installation of computer-based learning labs for diverse adult learning purposes in a largely uncritical embrace of technology. From the adult education professoriate one can hear oppositional responses to new technologies--responses that tend to be somewhat unidimensional and unreflective. At this point we need to begin to expose ourselves to challenging theories and investigations to move us beyond the current poles of the dichotomized debate: "Gee whiz, ain't technology swell" versus "technology as dehumanizing, antisocial learning device."

We need to begin serious, theoretically-informed consideration of phenomena such as computer-based instruction, media literacy, age/culture/gender in media consumption, telecommunications linkages, and multimedia. We need to become more aware of the work of thinkers such as Baudrillard (1988), who discusses media, consumption, language, and power. We should also know better the work of Mark Poster (1989), who integrates critical theory and poststructuralism to suggest that we are now in a "mode of information" that supersedes the "mode of production" upon which classical and revisionist Marxism is based.

Conclusion

As the outset of this talk, I suggested that I felt alienated from the "mainstream" of adult education. Maybe there is no mainstream any longer. I rather hope not. The seven excellent ideas I offer here may be idiosyncratic to my own experience, but I believe they represent some promising areas. I intend to continue looking into them, and I encourage others to join me.

References

Baudrillard, J. (1988). *Jean Baudrillard: Selected writings*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Brookfield, S. (1987). *Developing critical thinkers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review, 59*(3).

Foucault, M. (1972). *Archaeology of knowledge*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Herder & Herder.

Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligence. New York: Basic Books.

Gore, J. (1993). *The struggle for pedagogies: Critical and feminist discourses as regimes of truth*. New York: Routledge.

Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action. Volume One: Reason and the rationalization of society*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Hall, B. (1978). *Creating knowledge: Breaking the monopoly--research methods, participation, and development*. Ontario, Canada: OISE.

Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism, or the cultural logic of late capitalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Lave, J. (1988). *Cognition in practice: Mind, mathematics, and culture in everyday life*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lindeman, E. (1926, reprint 1961). *The meaning of adult education*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Luke, C., & Gore, J. (1992). *Feminisms & critical pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.

Lyotard, J. F. (1989). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Poster, M. (1989). *Critical theory & poststructuralism: In search of a context.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Rogoff, B., & Lave, J. (Eds.). (1984). *Everyday cognition: Its development in social context.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Scribner, S., & Cole, M. (1981). *The psychology of literacy.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sternberg, R., & Wagner, R. (Eds.). (1986). *Practical intelligence: Nature and origins of competence in the everyday world.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Toulmin, S. (1990). *Cosmopolis: The hidden agenda of modernism.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fred M. Schied

Panelist

Penn State University

Some Comments on the Crises of Academic Adult Education

One of the things that I like to do at the beginning of a semester is wander down the aisles at the university bookstore to see what texts are assigned in classes in and outside the College of Education. For me, this is a quick way to discover what topics are being addressed in other disciplines, what approaches are being taken, and what faculty members I may want to contact because they're working on questions that interest me. I did this during the past year, my first at Penn State. What I found was both troublesome and exciting from the perspective of the academic field of adult education. The books I found included Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and *Pedagogy of the City*, assigned in a graduate Educational Foundations class, Freire's and Horton's *We Make the Road by Walking* in a comparative education class, Glen's *Highlander: No Ordinary School* in an American history class, and writings by British feminist adult educators Sallie Westward and Jane Thompson assigned in a women's studies course and a sociology of work class. From my perspective, these works are all part of the literature of our field. The authors of these books and articles write about and for adult educators. Few of these works are new; *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* is almost 25 years old. Worse, when I talked to faculty members teaching these courses and to some of the students enrolled, none of them connected these works with the academic field of adult education. In fact, with only a few exceptions, most don't know that graduate programs in adult education exist. This, as I will discuss in greater detail later, presents the academic field of adult education with a major problem and an opportunity.

From Bookstore to Lecture Hall

In the first few weeks of my first semester, I had another experience which reinforced the situation we find ourselves in at Penn State and, I suspect, at many other universities. In the College of Education we have a series of lectures sponsored by the Waterbury Professor of Education, Henry A. Giroux. The first lecture in this series was given by Dr. Lawrence Grossberg, Professor of Cultural Studies at the University of Illinois. I risk oversimplifying here, but I see cultural studies as a relatively recent multidisciplinary approach that has broken down the barriers between the humanities and the social sciences. The emergence of cultural studies is, I think most observers of the academic scene would agree, a major theoretical development in contemporary social theory, and Grossberg is one of its most important figures. These attractions drew an audience of several hundred graduate students and professors from the College of Education and outside it. I encouraged the graduate students in our program to attend; I thought this would be a good opportunity for them to be exposed to contemporary social theory. Also in attendance were various university officials, including the dean of the College of Education.

Grossberg began his lecture by tracing the roots of cultural studies. In tracing these origins he said that the roots of cultural studies lie within British academic working class adult education, as represented by such individuals as Raymond Williams and E. P. Thompson. At this point my entire class turned to me with quizzical expressions. None of them had heard of Williams or Thompson; none of them were familiar with this mysterious field of cultural studies whose origins lay, according to Professor Grossberg, in their own field of study.

The awareness gap widened at the reception after the lecture: There Grossberg expressed surprise that one could receive a graduate degree in adult education. He was just as surprised to discover that none of the adult education graduate students were aware of any of the developments he spoke about. Grossberg made it clear that he was very familiar with the writings of Richard Johnson, the last director of the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, one of the most important outposts of cultural studies. Johnson is, I believe, one of the most important adult education historians and has published widely in British adult education literature, yet he is barely known within American academic adult education circles.

I think that these examples--the texts and the lecture--exemplify the crises we face within academic adult education. On the one hand, we see that adult education is of paramount importance to the current debates not only in education but within the broader realm of contemporary developments in social theory. Scholars in and outside of education use adult education texts, cite adult education literature, and are familiar with adult education theoretical developments. But what texts and theories are they referring to? Where are Knowles, Houle, *self-directed learning* and *andragogy*? Outside adult education and, to a lesser degree, human resource development, these theorists and theories go unmentioned and unnoticed. What scholars outside our field are reading, discussing and citing are works and authors that have been mostly confined to the margins of adult education. Would most graduate students in adult education say, for example, that Richard Johnson, Myles Horton, or Raymond Williams are central figures and that Knowles and Houle are

minor figures? Well, if one steps outside the insular world of adult education, that is exactly what we find others saying.

When I suggest that writers such as Williams, Thompson, and Richard Johnson are more significant theoreticians of adult education than more traditional figures, I am not arguing that these scholars are necessarily more significant on ideological grounds and or that we should convince our students that they need to agree with the analysis. I *am* arguing that it is essential for graduate students in adult education to become familiar with these scholars' work in order to engage in the broader contemporary educational debate. If we avoid these debates and discussions I believe our future as an academic field is grim.

Credibility at Stake

There are other immediate consequences of our failure to recognize how central adult education is to contemporary debates within education. On a day-to-day basis we in academic adult education are, as has been noted numerous times at this conference, trying to justify our very existence as a field. Oftentimes we are seen as marginalized within the university. On a very practical level, our credibility is called into question when we are unaware of or when we minimize ideas and developments coming out of adult education traditions that have had a profound impact on the broader world of education but minimal impact on our own fields. What does it say about our field when professors in women's studies programs or in labor studies programs are familiar with the work of Sally Westwood while we in American adult education have relegated her to some marginalized, intellectual corner called "radical adult education"?

Looking back at Professor Grossberg's Waterbury lecture from the perspective of university politics, I believe our credibility was badly shaken. Consider that the Dean of the College of Education was present at this lecture: The dean, while supportive of adult education, comes from a schooling background. Thus his understanding of our field is somewhat problematic. It is partly our job to educate him about what adult education is and why it is important. But from the dean's perspective, what conclusions can he draw from the Grossberg lecture? The dean may not be familiar with cultural studies, but he does know that this is an important topic--it is, after all, under the auspices of the college's Waterbury Chair, a very prestigious position. He also knows that Lawrence Grossberg is considered to be an outstanding scholar in his area. Furthermore, the dean has publicly stated that he is committed to making the College "second to none" in terms of scholarship and research. He then discovers that when distinguished scholar Grossberg places the origins of his field of cultural studies within adult education, graduate students in the field of adult education have only a vague idea of what he is talking about. Worse, from the dean's point of view, is that this distinguished scholar doesn't even know graduate programs in adult education exist! Our job of educating the dean on the importance of adult education has instantly become much more difficult. If colleagues in other fields who are busily citing the works of scholars writing within the field of adult education discover that we in adult education are only vaguely familiar with these works, how do we convince them of the importance of the academic field of adult education? Many of our colleagues already know the importance of adult education--they're familiar with Johnson, Friere, Horton, Westwood, *et al*. What they are *not* as convinced of is the legitimacy of an academic

field that seems so unfamiliar with its own theoretical and historical base. This, it seems to me, is the primary crisis facing adult education.

To quote an historical figure no longer in fashion, "What is to be done?" Partly, as we've heard at this conference, we are beginning to change. There are adult educators who are becoming increasingly active in the broader educational debate. Moreover, on a day-to-day basis we do need to become more actively involved with colleagues and programs outside our own area. I won't speak for others, but I would like to mention some of the small things I'm doing at Penn State to begin to make wider contracts. (I should preface this by saying that I'm not by nature very outgoing and find these kinds of efforts very difficult. Moreover, I've just begun my second year at Penn State, so I'm not very familiar with the culture of the institution. Nevertheless, I believe that these kinds of activities are crucial to our future.)

Here are a few examples of what I'm talking about. We are in a department that includes, in addition to adult education, vocational education and instructional systems. Largely through the efforts of Peter Cookson, we created an interprogram certificate in Human Resource Development-Workplace Learning. We don't know if this certificate will be successful or if it's going to survive more than a year, but it is an attempt to build linkages between programs. As part of this program I'm going to be offering a course entitled *Critical Perspectives on Work and Learning* in which we are going to take feminist and critical approaches to HRD and workplace learning. I'll be using works by Mechthild Hart, Sheryl Gowen, and Michael Welton; in other words, the course will take a very critical look at the entire notion of human resource development. It just so happens that one of the other individuals involved in this project is a very distinguished scholar of HRD, who has published extensively and has a national reputation. His conception of workplace learning is radically different from mine. Nevertheless, there is no reason we can't talk, debate, and discuss our varying interpretations. Why can't there be room for a variety of perspectives on workplace learning, including a perspective that is highly critical of the HRD approach? This, I think, is one way for us to begin to engage in a dialogue on an intellectual and personal level. Will it work? I'm not sure. It could be that there really isn't enough interest to sustain this effort or that our differences (both ideological and disciplinary) are too great to surmount. Nevertheless, it seems worth the effort.

I'm also going to try to have a Waterbury lecture co-sponsored by our program. From an intellectual standpoint this would be a good way to enter into the intellectual debates occurring within education and the social sciences, as well as to increase--I hope--our legitimacy and visibility.

Furthermore, since my particular area of interest is worker education, I've attempted to established contacts with the labor studies program here at Penn State. I've already presented at some of their events and am optimistic that this will continue.

These examples may seem rather minor and not very exciting. However, I think that it is our mundane day-to-day actions as well as our intellectual contributions that can lead to our becoming significant actors in educational debates.

Links across Disciplines

On another level, I'm trying to become involved in a reading and study group that cuts across colleges and disciplines. I think that what is happening is that disciplines, not just in education but in the social sciences as a whole, are fraying from the center, not just on the fringes. If we look at what is going on in other disciplines such as history, a field I'm particularly interested in, we find articles in academic journals debating such topics as the crisis in history and the critiques of "new" history (history of the body, ecological history, etc.), with some arguing that this type of history is the future of the field and others arguing that this type of research has nothing to do with history. At the other end of the ideological spectrum are historians bemoaning the loss of traditional historiographic approaches and calling for a return to the narrative. What is occurring in the discipline of history is a kind of a confused uncertainty, filled with contradiction. That is, of course, what some have called the postmodern condition. So the uncertainty and sense of crisis we feel at this meeting are not unique to adult education but also reflect, at least to some degree, larger concerns swirling around the academy in general.

In practical terms, what this means for the classes I teach is that we--teachers and students--need to reflect the crisis of legitimacy of adult education and be actively involved in the current debates occurring in the social sciences and education. We can't put feminism, postmodernism, racism, and colonialism on the margins of our field anymore. They are not "alternative" paradigms: They are central to the debate over what adult education is and should be. In my classes, I will stumble along trying to make these issues central to our discussion, not in some dominating way but reflecting the uncertainty and contradiction occurring in adult education and other social science disciplines.

Talmadge C. Guy
Panelist
University of Georgia

Adult Educators: Outspoken and Visible?

The adult education professoriate is confronting a number of challenges. We have seen evidence of this over the past couple of years with the testimonies by tenured professors whose programs are being threatened and challenged as universities realign and adjust their resources. Similar to other areas in the university, graduate study in adult education is increasingly confronted by challenges to its credibility and relevance. This is especially disturbing for many adult education departments because many programs are comprised of one- and two-person faculties where such challenges threaten the survival of the program. This questioning, which I would assert is not only normal but also healthy, through not comforting, calls for us as professors to periodically re-examine the bases on which we stand as producers, purveyors, and conveyors of adult education knowledge.

As a result of these threats, there has been growing interest within the Commission regarding the future of graduate programs; to me

this is only another instance of what may be considered a part of adult education practice. Despite such developments, graduate programs continue to demonstrate vitality in terms of the numbers of students applying for, gaining admission to, and graduating from graduate study in adult education. And as David Hemphill remarks, for example, adult educators have a strong tradition in qualitative and participatory research methods that helps to shed light on new and interesting questions. These two instances of the importance and relevance of graduate programs in adult education--growing enrollments and new insights about research--seem not to have had much effect on the perceptions of adult education graduate study both within colleges of education and within the university--at least at some universities.

Why is this? Two factors come to mind as I reflect on my experiences as an administrator in the community college system in Chicago. I see the kinds of threats noted by colleagues throughout this session of the CPAE as symptomatic. In my view, learning to survive is part of what it is to be an adult educator. So, the pessimistic tone should be replaced by a sense of optimism about new opportunities. There are two points that I wish to raise regarding strategies that the professioriate (individually and collectively) might adopt to counteract what is increasingly a threatening and volatile environment within which to be a professor--indeed, within which to be an adult education practitioner.

First, adult educators generally and professors in particular ought to become more outspoken and visible with respect to special issues that confront and are of interest to the broader public. We certainly do this as private citizens, but we ought to do more of it as adult educators. If we are seen as engaged with the major issues of our time, perhaps this will lay the groundwork for a broader understanding of how our particular perspectives and knowledge can be brought to bear on issues of broad public interest and concern. For example, in the recent contentious debate over the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the ongoing debate over health care are embedded a plethora of adult education issues. Adjustment to new change, development of new roles, and exploitation of new opportunities all require varying degrees of new knowledge and re-orientation. Furthermore, a broader and deeper analysis of the underlying factors that affect these and similar changes will lead to a wide variety of learning opportunities and situations for adults. Where are adult educators in understanding the issues and articulating views relative to the way in which these issues will impact the lives of communities? I'm sure adult educators are there, but they do not make themselves evident in the formal discussion within our journals or public opinion pieces.

Why is this visibility important? Among the things that we all lived through in the 1980s were the repeated attacks on education. And it was hardly important in the view of the general public that adult educators frequently observed that we were different: We weren't part of that system of traditional education that had so many problems. But when the attacks came, they were directed at <u>all</u> educators. The question, *What difference have you made concerning problems that people cared about, such as drop-outs, school failure, unemployment, illiteracy, immigration, poverty, welfare dependency, and economic development?* was often met with incredulity and inadequate answers that seemed innovative but in the end were, at best, band-aid solutions to more serious social problems. Adult educators along with others were implicated in the attack on education, often without a voice at the tables where decisions

were made. Little progress, overall, has been made towards developing consensus about how to address any of these great issues. And certainly there is no "adult education slant" on how to do so.

I don't mean to suggest that there can be or ought to be some uniform "adult education" perspective on major social issues. Such a perspective is not just Pollyanna-ish but also "unreal." I am suggesting that by making the attempt to connect our academic adult education practice with the real world, we become involved in a meaningful dialectic whereby our insights as adult educators/scholars can be sharpened within the context of real world issues; real world people can see adult educators as having something to say of a positive and useful nature. There is a strong tradition within the field that speaks to social issues; perhaps it is time to re-emphasize that tradition and turn away from the emphasis on technology.

My second point is that the face of the Commission itself ought to change. American society is being recognized as even more diverse, racially, ethnically, culturally, linguistically, and so on. And the professoriate here should be concerned that it also reflect that diversity. How can we as professors respond to, and be seen as responding to, issues of broad public concern and interest which are increasingly debated along the line of race, gender, or ethnicity, if our own ranks are fairly homogeneous along these same lines? We are hearing increasingly from the feminist perspective, and we see evidence of this perspective in the growing number of women in the professoriate. Yet, our ranks of African Americans, Native Americans, Hispanics and other groups are poorly representative.

I note, in one of the sessions on race and gender in adult education, the following statistics: Of 186 faculty listed in the Commission, 178 (96%) are white and 126 (68%) are male. While this is not a problem unique to adult education, it is or ought to be a point of concern for adult education. What can be done to expand the numbers of African American, Hispanic, and other ethnic or racial groups as professors? One of the ideas that seems to have worked in northeast Illinois is to connect adult education provider organizations with graduate programs in a way that provides graduate study opportunities for persons already engaged in adult education. Of course, this is helped when institutions adopt policies that encourage their employees to pursue additional training. If graduate students represent the ranks from which new professors may be drawn, then we need to address the issue of diversity within the ranks of our student bodies.

Diversity within the ranks of the graduate student body is also important because, as I have found over and again, many students bring to the classroom an interest related to issues of race, gender, and ethnicity, and how adult education deals with those issues. Yet, these issues are only partially and inadequately dealt with when experiential as well as ethnic and racial diversity are not reflected in the classroom. A number of workshop sessions, for example, here at this year's AAACE address the topic of diversity. Some of the student research presented supports the points that I am making here. The time is propitious for the professoriate to engage these issues in a realistic and effective manner.

So, in sum, the points that I want to make are these: As individuals and as a body, we as professors should get connected to

issues of importance and attention in the public interest; get grounded in the way that these issues are formulated, framed, and debated; and get in the mix of the public discussion regarding issues of broad public concern and importance. Doing so will help reinforce and expand the connection between adult education academia and the social action tradition within the field.

Our Past, New Visions, New Directions: Observations and Thoughts on the Closing Panel on Strengthening Graduate Departments

Adrian Blunt
University of Saskatchwan

Summer 1994

The conference discussions on the future of adult education in academe, which preceded the Sunday closing panel and plenary discussion, had been neither a celebration of the survival of programs to date nor a wake for our vainglorious past. Rather the meetings had been a sombre recitation of gloomy facts depicting troubled relationships between departments and their respective universities. The "heavy" discussions had begun on Friday evening with the Knox Committee (1993) and Sork (1993) reports on strengthening graduate programs and continued with requiems and reflective soliloquies.

On Saturday morning Commission members participated in small group discussions charged with the task of outlining new strategies for strengthening programs. A combination of proposed approaches emerged from the small groups including suggestions which can be depicted as circling the wagons, getting to know the enemy, seeking new alliances, striking out for new territory and joining the fray as a fifth column. The prevailing view was that the siege would be long, arduous, and that not all would survive. On this Sunday morning the most loyal of CPAE's troops gathered dutifully while shaking off the effects of the Saturday evening excesses and the chilling recollections of the Kennedy assassination of thirty years ago. Perhaps they were, as I was, hoping to be spared further stern exhortations to build stronger dykes, buttresses and towers. What I sought was a more optimistic campaign plan, preferably a strategy to go on the offensive, to "kick butt."

What followed was a refreshing and articulate analysis of alternative perspectives and understandings. The foundations for the panelists' views proved to be their personal experience and commitments to their adult education work. Brad Courtenay, as Chair for the panel session, had met with the panelists earlier when they had shared their views and planned their presentations. He alerted listeners to expect a different message and acknowledged his enthusiastic support for the positions to be presented.

Vanessa Sheared spoke of the Commission as a family who recognized the importance of "coming together" when challenged, yet "all talking at

once" and not listening attentively to others as they expressed their anger and frustration about the threats being experienced. She reminded listeners that what the Knox Committee and Sork reports were proposing were rational responses to irrational decisions. Referring to her research on the experience of women on welfare she drew the parallel between university administrators making uninformed decisions about adult education graduate programs and legislators and program administrators making welfare policy and program decisions without first understanding the experience of poverty and welfare. Her suggestions for action were constructed around the importance of working with others, understanding the broad contexts of adult education work and recognizing the fractured nature of society with its "divorced realities," that is the difference between what is and what ought to be. Rather than abandoning adult education's fundamental mission and principles in the hope of gaining increased security, Vanessa argued that Commission members ought to confront the irrationality of current academic restructuring. Resistance to the increased marginality of adult education within social institutions was necessary to gain entry into the discourse of change.

David Hemphill acknowledged the soundness of the suggestions from the Knox Committee and Sork reports and the small group discussions and reported having acted upon several of them in his department. However, rather than a report on that aspect of his experience he offered the group an alternative: "Dave's set of excellent ideas for survival." The refreshing aspect of the suggestions which followed was that, like Vanessa Sheared's, David's proposals were drawn from the intellectual adult education work he valued. David asked listeners to consider the strengths of adult education research in qualitative and participatory research and to note that the work of adult educators was gaining recognition in other disciplines. From inter-disciplinary recognition, he argued, came academic visibility, legitimacy and strength. Secondly he called for adult educators to re-assert the social purposes of adult education and to resist the pressures for adult education to become an agency in society whose primary or exclusive purpose was to support the achievement of technical-rational goals and economic imperatives.

Among the new fronts that David wished to see opened, that is sites where adult education researchers ought to be prominently engaged, were: adult literacy policy development; competency based education practices; multi-culturalism programs and the promotion of greater social inclusivity for marginalized communities; engagement with discourses around post-modernity; research into adult cognition, and studies of learners' experiences with new technologies. David's position, as I heard it, was that the immediate need was not for disciplinary retrenchment and a narrow interpretation of purpose. Instead he argued that adult education departments would be strengthened if they were recognized to be centrally involved with important social and academic issues.

The third panelist offered a less audible call for action. (Fred Schied spoke softly as he had literally lost his voice, likely in the Dallas eateries where he consumed prodigious quantities of salsa on Saturday evening.) Fred talked about the books and resources he used in his teaching and research. His essential point was that the books he valued most were not regarded, within adult education, as being "adult education literature." Tracing the origins of cultural studies to British working class studies, Fred argued for a broader recognition of the historical literature of adult education and a reconceptualization of the discipline's current perspectives on work and learning. My

interpretation of Fred's position was that adult education in academe is weakened as a consequence of not being informed by respected and valued literature from related disciplines. If adult educators ignore work that academics in related disciplines value, how are adult educators likely to be perceived and acted upon by those more powerful academics?

Tal Guy recalled two incidents from his experience as an adult education administrator to illustrate his views. Both incidents involved educators being challenged to re-define their purposes and priorities as are adult educators today. The lessons to be learned from these prior experiences were that threats to survival are commonplace; there is no reason to over-react and opportunities arise from these challenges. Tal outlined two broad responses that can be made by adult educators, each reflecting a different set of adult education priorities and expertise. Accepting survival as an aspect of daily practice and focusing efforts on the marginalized learners in society is a response guided by adult education's role in promoting social change. Responding to calls for shifts in adult education priorities by implementing human resource development initiatives is a response influenced by the professional and technical-rational orientation of adult education. Tal pointed out that the public and legislators do not regard adult educators as a discrete group in the education enterprise. Whatever judgments are made by the public about the worth and contributions of public school educators are also applied to adult educators. Maintaining a separate and supposedly superior stance does not endear us to other educators; neither does it yield any benefit from the public. By not being "at the table" in the broad discourse of educational change adult educators risk being the "objects" of decision making. Tal concluded by re-stating that active and visible participation at the provincial, or state, and local level debates is an essential aspect of any survival strategy.

The very positive impact of the panelists' views on the audience was due in large part, in my opinion, to the eloquent expression and interpretation of their intellectual work in terms of future strategies for strengthening their respective departments. Their strategic priorities were to pursue their research and advocacy work more vigorously and publicly. Rather than debate the legitimacy of their discipline within academe, their strategy was to demonstrate their legitimacy and worth within the academic and wider community. A respect for the work of others in a differentiated discipline of adult education, a holistic view of the role of education in society and a return to an interdisciplinary adult education research tradition were three important themes that I drew from the panelists' presentations. The panel made a major contribution to the improvement of the morale of those present. The session also provided a new sense of perspective and direction to enable departments and individual Commission members to move beyond the proposals identified in the earlier discussions. The implementation of those proposed strategies is a necessary but an insufficient organizational development step for the strengthening of departments.

It is somewhat surprising that Commission members have been engaged in a debate about the role of the Commission and the future of adult education in academe for several years, yet there has been little or no analysis of the changing context within which graduate departments function, that is within the changing context of the university itself. Do Commission members have an adequate understanding of the changes that are occurring within universities and the relations between the university and society? Do our understandings enable us to interpret events

broadly and to respond effectively over the long term, beyond the implementation of the proposed strengthening strategies?

While the Knox Committee and Sork reports recommend specific actions and strategies to be undertaken to preserve programs, beyond mentioning a lack of university resources, shifting priorities and academic competition they do not inform readers about the ubiquitous causes of threats to the existence of programs. The assumption made by those who commissioned the reports and accepted by those who wrote them and discussed them appears to be that all members wish to know, or need to know, is how to strengthen their programs until the insufficiency of resources goes away or the importance of adult education as an academic discipline is more widely accepted. Additional assumptions are that the resource insufficiency will be short term and temporary, that adult education will eventually be granted new resources or a better share of existing resources, and that others soon to be seen as less worthy will likely lose some of their current share. In my view this uncritical position is not one that members ought to be comfortable with and to choose, through inaction, to perpetuate.

In order to move beyond the immediate need to establish short term contingency plans for survival it will be necessary for faculty to enter the broader discourse of university change. While the recent economic recession has exacerbated the problems of higher education financing, not all of the changes being introduced into academe can be attributed to the recession, deficit reduction and global economic restructuring. The changes need to be considered from multiple perspectives including the political economy of higher education. In Canada faculty were alerted to the arrival of the "service-university" by the Science Council of Canada in 1986 (Newson 1992). During the late 1970's and through the 1980's researchers have been seeking to understand the forces at work to establish this new conception of the university and to identify the effects of the service-university on existing programs, students and faculty (see Axelrod 1982; Barrow 1990; Buchbinder & Newson 1991; Buchbinder & Rajagopal 1992; Newson 1992 & Zinberg 1991).

The gradual erosion of public confidence in the university has also been recognized for some years (Schein 1985) and the shift in university priorities from teaching to research has been identified as one culprit for the estrangement of town and gown (Sykes 1988). The efforts of adult education faculty to achieve professional recognition and disciplinary status through research and publication have been undertaken at a time when the university was placing higher value on these scholarly activities while neglecting or devaluing teaching and community service and contributing to the decline of public support. Adult educators have not established strong reputations on campuses as active members of the university community promoting and demonstrating the scholarship of teaching. It may be necessary in the future for Commission members to establish a more valid base for their departments' claims to teaching excellence and adult instruction expertise. To do this would require faculty to perceive themselves as university faculty members, that is members of the "key profession"(Clark 1987), rather than adult educators who happen to work in colleges or faculties of education on university campuses. In this case it will be necessary for some faculty members to abandon their use of adult education as an ideological weapon to assert the distinctiveness and superiority of their practice. One outcome of adult education's self-imposed andragogical isolation within education, and intra-disciplinarity within social science research, has been the

reproduction within graduate departments of an undesirable orthodoxy of practice and an atheoretical research tradition. I suggest that Commission members, to prepare long term strategies for the strengthening of adult education in academe, need to consider their work as faculty members from a holistic perspective of lifelong education and an integrated view of social science research.

Bill Griffith and others reminded listeners during meetings that if numbers of adult education faculty are an indicator of the success of adult education in academe the Commission has reason to celebrate. However, the history of the Commission is not widely known and some would say that the history of adult education is similarly not well known. I suspect, also, that little is known by Commission members about the history of the Western university. In this respect adult education faculty are probably no different than the majority of their colleagues in related disciplines. Yet a long term view of the university's changing role in society may be necessary if the current challenges to the university are to be considered from other than a self-interested and short-term view. Commission members are members of the academic profession and Burton Clark's view of that profession may help to place the "crisis" being faced by adult education departments into a slightly different perspective:

> What was always so is now much more so: the academic profession is many professions, a loosely coupled array of varied interests. The nineteenth- and twentieth-century expansion of higher education has multiplied the settings that are the foundations of academic work, belief and authority. Student clientele has shifted from elite to mass; subjects have proliferated in a broadening stream of knowledge; outputs of graduates and services are unremittingly numerous and varied. Moving further into complexity, the profession comes to resemble a caucus of subprofessions and that array. . . will be arranged differently in different countries by the interaction of the national, institutional, and disciplinary settings ...
>
> This modern "key profession" is a product of eight centuries of higher education in the Western world. Inescapably, it will continue to have a key role in society, even as it becomes more difficult to grasp. If social analysis pursues worthy problems then it will invest more fully in the effort to grasp the constancy and the change in the lives of academics and to base views of their work and their services on fact rather than fiction (Clark 1987, p. 397).

Clark's suggestion that the future of the academic profession lies in its demonstrated value to society was echoed in the panelists' statements summarized earlier. The most effective strategy for furthering adult education as an academic field of university study and applied field of educational practice may lie in serving society in those ways which society values and respects. Adult educators have good reason to be concerned about the "new-right" ideology which has arrived on campuses to the detriment of programs and individuals' careers. However, by moving beyond a narrow defense of adult education programs and shifting our thinking to incorporate an understanding of our broader roles as university academics we may be able to reconceptualize adult education in academe and participate more effectively in the alliance

building that is underway across disciplines. Many speakers acknowledged the importance of alliances to vigorously resist some of the changes being imposed upon us. Hopefully we might also concurrently propose alternative priorities for the university based on adult education visions of the future, visions drawn from our historical commitment to social change and our pragmatic interest in supporting society's drive towards economic prosperity. Where we are today is a good place from which to begin this work.

References

Axelrod, P. (1982). *Scholars and dollars.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Barrow, C. W. (1990). *Universities and the capitalist state: Corporate liberalism and the reconstruction of American higher education.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Buchbinder, H., & Newson, J. (1990). Corporate university links in Canada: Transforming a public institution. *Higher Education, 20,* pp. 355-379.

Buchbinder, H., & Rajagopal, P. (1992). *The politics of funding: Austerity, academic work and university governance.* A paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Higher Education. Washington, DC, August 21-23.

Clark, B. R. (Ed.) (1987). *The academic profession: National, disciplinary, and institutional settings.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Knox, A. B., Caffarella, R., Courtenay, B., Deshler, D., & Ross-Gordon, J. (1993). *Strengthening university support for adult education graduate programs.* A report presented to members of the Commission of Professors of Adult Education annual meeting. Dallas, TX, November 19.

Newson, J. (1992). *The university of the 1980's: Harbinger of the post-industrial state?* A paper presented at the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association annual conference, University of Prince Edward Island, May 30-June 2.

Sork, T. (1993). *Strengthening university support for adult* education graduate programs: Western Canadian perspectives. A report presented to members of the Commission of Professors of Adult Education annual meeting. Dallas, TX, November 19.

Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sykes, C.J. (1988). *Prof Scam: Professors and the demise of higher education.* New York: St. Martins Press.

Zinberg, S. D. (1991). *The changing university: How increased demand for scientists and technology is transforming academic institutions internationally.* Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Special Interest Groups

Five CPAE special interest groups (SIGs) met during the Dallas conference. Some offered formal presentations. Others used the allotted time to assess interest and plan future directions of the group.

SIG reports made available for these *Proceedings* are arranged below in alphabetical order by the name of the SIG.

Critical Theory Special Interest Group

Reporting:
Talmadge C. Guy
Chair
University of Georgia

The Critical Theory Special Interest Group met to discuss issues of concern to those present and possible future directions of the group. A brief history was provided by the chair, following by discus-sion concerning potential topics for next year's conference.

A consensus emerged among those present regarding the contemporary importance of "diversity" as an issue of growing interest and importance. The group decided that next year's conference should take a critical look at what is often meant by *diversity* and how the term serves to separate as well as unite persons and groups. Feminist, Afri-centric, and other perspectives will be sought to help bring further breadth and septh of understanding of these issues.

The group elected Barbara Sparks as chairperson for the coming year.

Human Resource Development Special Interest Group

The HRD SIG, chaired by Bert Wiswell, Virginia Tech, had planned a presentation entitled "Meeting Continuing Education Needs with Satel-lite Learning Resources." When the scheduled presenter could not attend, the group launched an informal discussion of technology advances and potential.

Instructional Improvement Special Interest Group

Co-Chairs:
Cheryl J. Polson
Kansas State University

Bart Beaudin
Colorado State University

First Session: *Textbook Authors--Preaching or Practice?*

Reporting:
Cheryl Polson

This Instructional Improvement Special Interest Group (SIG) presentation featured four authors of current textbooks related to teaching adult learners. They were invited by the SIG co-chairs to be a part of the panel and to address how they integrate ideas and concepts promoted in their books into the courses they teach. In other words, do these authors "practice what they preach"?

All of the panel members taught courses which pertained to teaching adult learners, or courses which dealt with the adult as a learner, and were asked to focus their discussion on those courses. The panel members, their institutions, and the courses they selected were:

Rosemary Caffarella, University of Northern Colorado

Seminar in Learning in Adulthood
Staff Development and Training
Program Planning for Adults

Betty Hayes, University of Wisconsin - Madison

The Adult Learner

Roger Hiemstra, Syracuse University

Methods and Techniques for Teaching Adults

Burt Sisco, University of Wyoming

Teaching Adult Learners

Some of the initial responses to the question "How to you practice what you preach?" related to what an author should do when using--as a required text--a textook he or she has written. There appeared to be a consensus that authors must *model consistency* across what they do in action and what they preach. *Inviting and utilizing student feedback* regarding the textbook was a second area explored by panel members, who said the teacher/author should listen to students' feedback, be open to criticism from students, and encourage students to explore whether what is written in the text fits their workplace realities. When it doesn't fit, find out why it doesn't. Related comments addressed the difficulty of narrowing subject matter when one is teaching from resources one has authored.

The session focused predominantly on techniques the panel members use to put their ideas into action. After panelists distributed copies of selected syllabi, each discussed specific ways in which she or he incorporated ideas into the classroom. Many ideas were offered as a rich dialogue progressed between panelists and the audience. Below is a very brief sketch of selected ideas:

1. It is critical to address initially the learning preferences found within any classroom. One panelist suggested teachers take time "up front" to discuss learning styles and the limitations of learning style research. One option is to have the students take a learning style inventory to illustrate how people might be different in their styles. A simple exercise which could be used in conjunction with a learning style inventory or without such a tool is to have each student interview another student to see whether their own approaches to learning are similar. The key to dealing with diversity among learners is varying the instructional activities so all learning styles are not only addressed but also challenged.

2. Class symposia were described. After major content areas have been introduced, students conduct a symposium designed to assist them in pulling the material together. Modeling the various components of effective teaching is stressed.

3. Poster sessions were also described. Students are asked to depict a concept via a poster and are given an opportunity to explain what the poster represents to them. Reaction teams are established to ask focused questions regarding the posters. There is a debriefing exercise during which students discuss the experience.

4. One panel member distributes his personal philosophy statement to learners enrolled in his classes. His underlying premise for teaching any course is that learners can take increasing responsibility for their own learning. He believes students need to know "where he is coming from" as he begins each course. In addition to providing his own statement, he provides a bibliography of readings written by authors who hold different points of view. Students are encouraged to use these resources in their development of personal teaching philosophies.

5. Reading reviews were described. Providing summaries of material which learners will be reading was suggested as a simple technique which can enhance the learning process.

6. Learning contracts, gaming and simulation exercises, and theory logs were suggested as ways to encourage critical thinking and to increase student involvement.

7. Involving students in needs assessment as well as in conducting instructor evaluations was also encouraged.

8. Panel members stressed that the tacit dimension of learning needs to have greater emphasis.

It became apparent that these effective instructors support as well as challenge their learners. The richness of the ideas presented is difficult to capture in a summary. However, it was evident that these authors do indeed practice what they preach.

Second Session: *Approaches to Developing Critical Reflection*

Stephen Brookfield
University of St. Thomas

Summarized for the *Proceedings* by Cheryl Polson

Exercises and methods for developing the skill of critical reflection were discussed in this session. Brookfield presented his informal theory of critical reflection and the reasoning behind his ideas. Included was a focus on good practices, the critical conversation, and critical incidents.

He began his presentation by discussing potential inhibitors to critical reflection. These fall into three major categories: psychological (*e. g.*, fear of change, self-esteem, roadrunning, impostership, lost innocence); cognitive (unconnectedness, great leap forward, ruts and patterns); and political/cultural (cultural suicide, secrecy, lack of modeling).

A portion of the workshop time was spent discussing how he uses critical incidents in the classroom: The concept is introduced in the class syllabus. At the end of each class meeting, students are provided with double-copy critical-incident forms. They keep one copy for further learning analysis and submit the second copy to Brookfield. Prior to the next class session he reviews the forms and provides written comments. During the first 20 minutes of the next session he returns the forms; themes found throughout the incidents are discussed.

He has found that it can be useful for students to see how their classmates have experienced the class session. Therefore, he occasionally distributes a handout outling portions of the critical incident feedback provided by students. He emphasized in the workshop that it is important for instructors to model emotional openness when they want to encouraged the same behavior in their students; thus he suggests that instructors may also want to consider providing students with their own personal reactions to a particular class session.

Brookfield believes critical incidents help instructors identify where resistance--which as an issue is seldom publicly addressed--may be originating. Critical incidents help get to the core of resistance, which then allows instructors to address the surrounding issues. The incidents also help teachers avoid making *intuitive* decisions (as contrasted with *researched* decisions) about such matters as class formats and instructional techniques.

Brookfield distributed to workshop participants a critical incident form containing these questions:

1. At what moment in the class today did you feel most engaged with what was happening?

2. At what moment in the class today did you feel most distanced from what was happening?

3. What action that anyone (teacher or student) took in class today did you find most affirming or helpful?

4. What action that anyone (teacher or student) took in class today did you find most puzzling or confusing?

5. What about the class today surprised you the most? (This could be something about your own reactions to what went on, or something that someone did, or anything else that occurs to you).

As a second focus of the workshop, Brookfield introduced a framework for working with groups of practitioners, and an exercise to encourage groups to analyze their experiences. In the exercise, individual group members are asked to think about a specific learning experience in which they analyze their worse response and their best response as a learner, as a colleague, and as a teacher. The ultimate goal is to help participants understand how much they already know and to affirm that they know more than they thought they did. The experiences introduced through the exercise can then be used as a foundation upon which to build new knowledge.

Brookfield also discussed how instructors can encourage students to analyze critically adult-education texts. His ideas have recently been published as a journal article. He provided a handout based on the article; it contained these questions, which instructors can use to encourage students to do critical thinking:

Questions for Critical Analysis of Adult Educational Texts

Brookfield, S. (1993). Breaking the code: Engaging practitioners in critical analysis of adult educational literature. *Studies in the Education of Adults, 25*(1), 64-91.

Critical Reading Happens When Readers--

1. Make explicit the assumptions authors hold about what constitutes legitimate knowledge and how such knowledge comes about.

2. Take alternative perspectives on the knowledge being offered so that this knowledge comes to be seen as culturally constructed.

3. Undertake positive and negative appraisal of the grounds for, and expression of, this knowledge.

4. Analyse commonly held adult educational ideas for the extent to which they oppose democratic values.

Epistemological Questions

1. Are the ideas presented by writers already predetermined by the intellectual paradigm in which they work?

2. To what extent are the central insights of a piece of literature--whether these are framed as research findings, theoretical propositions or philosophical injunctions--grounded in documented empirical evidence?

3. To what extent does the writing seem culturally skewed?

4. To what extent are descriptive and prescriptive fused in an irresponsible and inaccurate way?

Experiential Questions

1. How do the metaphors for teaching used in a piece of educational literature compare to the metaphors you use to describe your own experience of practice?

2. What experiential omissions are there in a piece of literature that, to you, seem important?

3. To what extent does a piece of literature acknowledge and address ethical issues in teaching?

4. What connections and discrepancies do you note between the descriptions of adult learning processes and adult educational practices contained in a piece of academic literature and your own experiences as an adult learner and adult educator?

Communicative Questions

1. Whose voices are heard in a piece of academic writing?

2. To what extent does the literature use a form of specialized language that is unjustifiably distanced from the colloquial language of adult learners and adult educators?

3. To what extent does literature show a connectedness to practice?

Political Questions

1. Whose interests are served by the publication of a text?

2. To what extent are models and ideal types of adult educational practice reified, presented as beyond human agency?

3. To what extent do texts present teachng and learning processes as only individual acts?

4. What naturally assumed forms of curricular and programmatic provision stifle collectivism?

5. How do texts prescribe roles that retain the professional distance between educators and learners?

6. Do evaluative criteria and forms proposed to judge the merit of adult education programs support the status quo and leave laissez faire capitalism as an educational and cultural as well as economic mode unchallenged?

7. What contribution does a piece of writing make to the understanding and realization of democratic forms and processes?

8. In writing on adult educational change, to what extent are the political impediments to educational innovations addressed?

International Special Interest Group

Reporting:

Athalinda McIntosh
University of Surrey

Gretchen Bersch
University of Alaska

Based on the interest and feedback both of those present at the SIG meeting and of others who were not in Dallas but had sent messages, we unanimously and eagerly decided to continue the SIG. Those present will be the planning group for Nashville.

We identified some possible functions and agreed to consider the following:

1. Recreating a network/internet between and among us
2. Making more information available about international conferences and meetings
3. Creating a directory of international contact people
4. Taking issues important to professors and internationalizing them
5. Collecting information about the areas of research with which international students are involved

We decided to propose an audio and/or computer conference session for the Nashville meeting in 1994. We are considering "An International Conversation" on a specific theme. The session should be a minimum of two hours in length and be scheduled as a general session so that other SIGs can contribute to it. The intent would be to have key figures from the adult education professoriate on different continents join us in dialogue without leaving home geographically. (Material could be distributed in advance.) Another part of the vision for this event is participation by groups of students and faculty around the world.

We will serve as SIG co-chairs for 1994. Along with Marcie Boucouvalas, chair of International Associates, we agreed to link with the planners of the 1994 CPAE program.

Research and Theory Building Special Interest Group

Reporting:
Trenton R. Ferro
Chair
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

First session: *Recent Developments in Learning Style Research*

Waynne James, University of South Florida, presented findings from her exploratory research into learning styles. Using a variety of instruments, she has calculated Pearson product-moment correlations between a variety of subtests purporting to measure the same construct. She has used the results of these correlations, along with material provided by instrument producers and distributors, to develop a guide and critique of a broad range of learning style instruments.

For additional introductory information, see

James, W. B., and Blank, W. E. (1993). Review and critique of available learning-style instruments for adults. In Daniele D. Flannery (Ed.), *Applying cognitive learning theory to adult learning* (pp. 47-57). *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 59. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

The business meeting was chaired by the SIG chair, Trenton R. Ferro. Discussion centered around suggestions for topics for the 1994 meeting in Nashville. Members of the Commission are invited to submit suggestions. This invitation will also be included in the next newsletter.

Gary J. Dean, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, was selected to serve with Trenton Ferro as co-chair of the SIG for the coming year.

Second session: *Panel - Research Perspectives in Adult Education*

This panel was coordinated by D. Randy Garrison, editor of a editor of a volume under the panel's title to be released by Krieger in November, 1994. The volume explores the production and promotion of research in adult education; explains the canons of the research process, including the current status and future prospects; explicates publishing standards in adult education; removes the mystique surrounding such publication; and develops an overall framework from descriptions of specific research methods.

Panelists and their presentation/chapter titles were D. Randy Garrison, University of Calgary, "An Epistemological Overview of the Field" and "Methodological Issues"; Thomas Sork, University of British Columbia, "Issues in Collaborative Research"; Roger Hiemstra, Syracuse University, and Ralph Brockett, University of Tennessee, "Collaboration, Networking, and the Research Community"; Sharan Merriam, University of Georgia, "Writing and Submitting a Manuscript for Publication"; William Griffith, University of British Columbia, "Graduate Training and Research"; and Adrian Blunt, University of Saskatchewan, whose paper begins below.

The Future of Adult Education Research: Beyond the Paradigm Wars and Intra-Disciplinarity

Adrian Blunt
University Of Saskatchewan

In my contribution (Blunt 1994) to *Developments in Adult Education Research* (Garrison 1994) I consider the future of research from the perspective of both process and product. My purpose is not to predict the most likely future, or futures, for adult education research but to argue for a particular preferred future and to persuade others to act in their spheres of personal and public influence to achieve this future. In this sense my view and argument are inherently political, emanating from personal understandings of the purposes of adult education and the processes of social science research. My intent is to promote a future that I prefer.

The first step I take in my chapter is to present a view of the current state of research, as both process and product. If readers agree with my interpretations the stage is set for the consideration of a future that is an alternative to the one most likely to emerge if the status quo is simply extrapolated. The alternative that I propose is not presented as a vignette of researchers engaged in their future work; rather it is presented as an organizing framework built on pluralism of discipline, paradigmatic view, methodology, and research priority. The future I argue for is, in my opinion, one that respects the historical origins of adult education research; is purposeful without being overly limiting and exclusionary; and offers a post-modern framework appropriate for the democratization of research and closer relations between practitioner and academic.

Research as Process

Any consideration of the future of adult education research as a process needs to take into account an analysis of factors influencing the likely ways in which researchers will choose to perceive their world in the future. The implications of these choices for the training of researchers and the conduct of research are fundamental to the discussion. The present assumptions and paradigmatic views influencing the conduct of research and the structures in place to train the current population of graduate students are the prime determinants of views that the next generation of researchers will hold.

It is my contention that the adult education research enterprise today is fractured by competing paradigmatic views, methodologically weak and relatively uninformed by research from related social science disciplines. Further, I contend that these conditions within adult education research are largely self-inflicted, perpetuated by disciplinary isolation and highly deleterious for our future intellectual work. The literature of adult education today does not alert the current generation of researchers-in-training to these concerns and the resulting disciplinary isolationism will most likely prevent rapid adjustment and perpetuate the status quo.

While the "paradigm wars" (Gage 1989) and their implications for adult education research have been summarized and occasionally commented on in the adult education literature (Merriam & Cunningham 1989; Peters, Jarvis & Associates 1991), researchers generally appear to be unaware of the shifts in social science research thinking that have occurred during the debate over paradigmatic correctness (see for example Husen 1985; Firestone 1987; Salomon 1991 & Phillips 1992). Consequently opportunities, as they have occurred, to bring the debate to closure in adult education research have passed unrecognized. An insightful analysis of the arguments raised during the debate has not been sustained in the adult education literature. Consequently researchers have adopted and maintained adversarial positions to the detriment of scholarly research and ultimately the field of adult education practice. Qualitative and recently critical adult education researchers have attacked the so-called positivists, and each other, often in the cause of establishing a more humanistic research tradition. Issues in the paradigm wars gradually became, over time, fundamental concerns in the intellectual work of researchers to the point that, whether they wished to or not, each researcher to some extent became engaged in the struggle, or was disarmed and immobilized by it. Practitioners, on the other hand, influenced by the essential pragmatism of their work, have become dismayed and unsympathetic observers of the unproductive internecine sniping among the ranks of the researchers.

Many of the current generation of researchers now hold partisan beliefs about research processes and methodologies and act in adversarial ways, overtly and covertly, towards colleagues holding so-called competing paradigmatic views. Approaches to the conduct of research are not simply individual expressions of open choices. "Rather they are socially embedded in intellectual communities, networks of like-minded practitioners" (Brewer & Hunter 1989, p. 26). The socialization and training of students currently enrolled in graduate programs are the major determinants of the skills, value orientations and beliefs of the next generation of researchers. The future of research as a process is currently vested in graduate programs, many of which maintain, in my view, the incorrect belief that choices must be made between oppositional paradigms before a research project can commence.

To persuade readers that it is possible to leave the "paradigm wars" to the philosophers of science and to support a multi-method and multi-paradigmatic culture I urge them to consult Phillips' (1992) *The Social Scientist's Bestiary: A Guide to Fabled Threats to, and Defenses of, Naturalistic Social Science*. On the continuing attacks on positivism by naturalistic researchers, Phillips writes:

> Nowadays the term 'positivist' is widely used as a generalized term of abuse. As a literal designator it has ceased to have any useful function - those philosophers to whom the term accurately applies have long since shuffled off this mortal coil, while any living social scientists who either bandy the term around, or are the recipients of it as an abusive label, are so confused about what it means that, while the word is full of sound and fury, it signifies nothing (p. 95).

It ought also now to be obvious that a focus on the technical aspects of research, the dominant focus in most graduate research classes, does not lead directly to the construction of theory or to the solution of problems of practice. To establish a more constructive and

rational future for adult education research requires not only that the paradigm wars be abandoned but that the adult education research enterprise become more firmly grounded epistemologically.

One additional problem is that of the standards of research in adult education. For many years observers have commented that our research expertise has lagged behind that of related social science disciplines. Although research standards have improved, the gap in standards between adult education and related disciplines has not been narrowed because adult educators have not caught up with advances in social science research methods and techniques. If the future we wish to achieve for adult education research is one in which disparaging comments about the quality of our published work are not heard it will be necessary for us to re-establish our interdisciplinary connections and seek training for our graduates within the "harder" social science disciplines such as sociology, psychology and philosophy. It is in these disciplines that the expertise in methodology we urgently need, and the means of strengthening our epistemological foundations, are to be found.

Research as Product

While adult education's research content has evolved gradually over time, new knowledge being introduced today is being brought about by almost exactly the same forces that have contributed to the development of adult education over the last 30 or 40 years. Unless the near future brings major shifts in external social and economic forces, the product of adult education research in the next two or three decades will be little different from today's product. Support for an intra-disciplinary research orientation continues to prevail; our research continues to be largely atheoretical; and, generally speaking, our knowledge-building efforts continue to be unsystematic and non-cumulative.

I present evidence to support the conclusions summarized above by building on earlier work to map the territory of adult education (Rubenson 1982). The same criteria as those originally applied by Rubenson are used to determine which research questions are regarded as legitimate within the discipline of adult education. I conclude that little has changed over the last two decades to shift adult education research from its historical commitments to pragmatism and applied rather than basic research and from intra-disciplinary research in support of the drive towards professionalization. Also unchanged are the discipline's relatively insecure epistemological foundations. While the governing research tradition has had to adjust to the recent arrival of feminist and critical adult education research, the overall impact of research in these areas has done little to change the essentially middle class, white, male, eurocentric culture of the adult education research community in North America. In *The Literature of Adult Education* (Houle 1992), which cites 1,241 books written for adult educators largely by adult educators, the terms *feminist*, *gender*, *social class* and *ethnic status* do not appear in the subject index. I interpret their omission as an indication that adult education books are not addressing important social issues. Under the subject heading "Research for body of adult education knowledge," only seven books are listed; the small number highlights the dearth of scholarly writing and research in this area.

Although researchers have frequently voiced calls for a return to an inter-disciplinary research focus (see Boshier 1973; Nordhaug 1987 &

Rubenson 1989) the prevailing view over the last three decades has been in favour of an intra-disciplinary focus (see Apps 1979; Boyd & Apps 1980). One of the most frequently cited arguments in favour of intra-disciplinarity is that presented by Boyd and Apps (1980). I contest their argument, which is based on what they term four erroneous assumptions made by Jensen (1964) in the "black book." My point is that these four so-called erroneous assumptions are actually facets of bad social science research practice. What Boyd and Apps argue is that adult educators ought to distance themselves from other disciplines because Jensen did not acknowledge the dangers of misappropriating knowledge and errors can be made by researchers through ignorance or lack of vigilance if they attempt to incorporate research from other disciplines. I attempt to discredit Boyd and Apps' view by interpreting it as anti-intellectual and serving the interests of those whose first priority is to professionalize adult education. If Boyd and Apps' fears are to be taken seriously, a more appropriate position for adult education researchers to take is to maintain their expertise and strong connections with the related disciplines.

The most recently published texts addressing issues and concerns of the discipline of adult education do not offer, in my opinion, clear visions of alternative futures. In the current institutional climate of budgetary restraints and restructuring, and given the lack of vision for the future of adult education as a field of study, the most likely future for research as product for the next two decades appears to be a simple continuance of the present state. For those who wish to see a more vigorous, socially relevant and methodologically current adult education literature the prognosis for change does not look promising. A forceful intervention and sustained commitment by researchers committed to inter-disciplinary studies, critical analysis, and sustained knowledge building and integration are required if an alternative future is to emerge from the current unfocussed disciplinary morass.

Towards An Alternative Research Future

It is from a position of dissatisfaction with the most likely anticipated future for adult education research that I propose an alternative. To achieve the future that I propose, four elements of change need to be introduced into today's research enterprise. The first element is acceptance of the legitimacy and desirability of a multi-paradigm research culture and concurrent acceptance of multi-method research strategies. Second, more researchers will need to adopt a long term orientation to their intellectual work that will require them to adopt an inter-disciplinary research orientation. Third, an immediate commitment to the renewal of graduate research training is needed. The last change required is a commitment to the democratization of the research enterprise itself.

I offer a suggestion for developing a more detailed map, or maps, of the territory of adult education based on Becher's (1987) simple analytical framework, which reveals how disciplines differ in terms of their actions and behaviours. Adult education has reached the point where its research can be differentiated on the basis of its being judged to be "hard" or "soft" in terms of its relationship with other social science disciplines and "basic" or "applied" in terms of its contribution to adult education as a discipline or an applied field of social practice. This strategy allows linkages with other disciplines to

be made explicit; contributions of departments, individuals and organizations to be mapped; and knowledge to be integrated and synthesized.

My view of university adult education programs and the work of faculty in the future is influenced by Clark's (1989) view of postmodern academic life. While Peters (1991) proposes a relationship with other disciplines which locates adult education alongside--not within--disciplines, Clark (1989) offers a view of disciplines functioning as overlapping and interlocking cultural communities. My choice of metaphor for Peters' view is that of the suburban housing development with detached houses, property lines and white picket fences. Clark's view I interpret as the modern condominium development with private space, public space and a common interest in shared space. Clark's view, in my opinion, is more realistic and desirable. It offers the most potentially beneficial prospects for adult education and allows us to move in from the margins.

> **The** [emphasis in original] analytical handle is the idea of integration through overlap. Then we no longer need to think, as observers or participants, that integration can come about only by means of some combination of identical socialization, similarity of task, commonly held values, and united membership in a grand corps or association. Academics need not think that they must somehow pull themselves together around a top-down pronouncement of a fixed set of values swimming against the tide of history and seeking a return to a golden age that never was. As we probe the nature of the modern academic life, especially in America, it is much more fruitful to grasp that integration can come from the bit-by-bit overlap of narrow memberships and specific identities (Clark 1989, p. 8).

The future I propose holds greater promise, in my opinion, for the current and future generations of researchers than the future most likely to occur if we choose to continue along our current paths. It respects the contributions of prior generations of researchers and allows us to return to a more promising direction than the intra-disciplinary route we have been travelling.

References

Apps, J. W. (1979). *Problems in continuing education.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Becher, T. (1987). The disciplinary shaping of the profession. In B. R. Clark (Ed.), *The academic profession: National, disciplinary, and institutional settings* (pp. 271-303). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Blunt, A. (1994). The future of adult education research. In R. Garrison (Ed.), *Developments in adult education research.* Malabar, FL: Krieger.

Boyd, R. D., & Apps, J. W. (1980). A conceptual model for adult education. In R. D. Boyd, J. W. Apps & Associates (Eds.), *Redefining the discipline of adult education* (pp. 1-13). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Boshier, R. (1973). Educational participation and drop-out: A theoretical model. *Adult Education, 23*, 255-282.

Brewer, J., & Hunter, A. (1989). *Multimethod research: A synthesis of styles.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Clark, B. R. (1989). The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds. *Educational Researcher, 18*(5), 4-8.

Firestone, W. A. (1987). Meaning in method: The rhetoric of quantitative and qualitative research. *Educational Researcher, 16*(7), 16-21.

Gage, N. L. (1989). The paradigm wars and their aftermath: A "historical sketch" of research on teaching since 1989. *Educational Researcher, 18*(7), 4-10.

Garrison, R. (Ed.). (1994). *Developments in adult education research.* Malabar, FL: Krieger.

Houle, C. O. (1992). *The literature of adult education: A bibliographic essay.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Husen, T. (1985). Research paradigms in education. In T. Husen & T. N. Postlethwaite (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of education,* Vol. 7 (pp. 4335-4338). Oxford: Pergamon.

Jensen, G. (1964). How adult education borrows and reformulates knowledge of education. In G. Jensen et al (Eds.), *Adult education: Outlines of an emerging field of university study* (pp. 105-111). Washington: Adult Education Association of the U.S.A.

Merriam, S. B., & Cunningham, P. M. (Eds.). (1989). *Handbook of adult and continuing education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nordhaug, O. (1987). Adult education and social science: A theoretical framework. *Adult Education Quarterly, 38*(1), 1-13.

Peters, J. M., Jarvis, P., & Associates (Eds.). (1991). *Adult education: Evolution and achievements in a developing field of study.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Phillips, D. C. (1992). *The social scientist's bestiary: A guide to fabled threats to, and defenses of, naturalistic social science.* New York: Pergamon Press.

Rubenson, K. (1982). Adult education research: In quest of a map of the territory. *Adult Education, 32*(2), 57-74.

Rubenson, K. (1989). Adult education research: General. In C. J. Titmus (Ed.), *Lifelong education for adults: An international handbook* (pp. 507-511). Toronto: Pergamon Press.

Salomon, G. (1991). Transcending the qualitative-quantitative debate: The analytic and systemic approaches to educational research. *Educational Researcher, 20*(6), 10-18.

Final Comment: Closing Session of the 1993 Conference

Ralph G. Brockett

I'd like to thank the panelists for their remarks. This is certainly an exciting way to end our conference. So much has been said that I feel there is little that I can add at this point.

However, I would like to leave you with two themes that stood out for me throughout the conference. The first theme is *courage*. We saw this in the opening panel, in Rosemary Caffarella's powerful presentation of the situation at the University of Northern Colorado. And we clearly saw it in the moving account by my good friend Rogert Hiemstra of the demise of the Syracuse program. We heard it throughout the conference in comments by various colleagues about numerous challenges and threats to many of our programs. We also saw it this morning in the presentation by Tal Guy--when he discussed his experiences in the community-college setting. And we saw it in Fred Scheid, who made insightful remarks in spite of laryngitis.

The second theme I will take away from this conference is *hope*. I need look no further than this panel sitting beside me to know that the future of our field is in good hands. Vanessa Sheared, David Hemphill, Fred Schied, and Tal Guy have left us with some important thoughts. Adrian Blunt, who has been absorbing and integrating those remarks, will write a reflective analysis to include in the conference proceedings.

Perhaps the greatest lesson that we might learn from this conference is the importance of making sure that the CPAE is a place for all voices to be heard. For me, inclusiveness means *all*, not *alternative*!

Thank you for being a part of this conference. Until our next "family reunion" next year in Nashville, have a safe trip home.

Participants

1993 Annual Conference
Commission of Professors of Adult Education

Name	Institution or Agency
Suzanne Adair	Texas Department of Health
Donna D. Amstutz	University of Wyoming
Katie Barwick-Snell	University of Oklahoma
Bart P. Beaudin	Colorado State University
Gretchen Bersch	University of Alaska
Laura Bierema	Allied Signal
Adrian Blunt	University of Saskatchewan
David L. Boggs	Ohio State University
Adrianne Bonham	Texas A&M University
Kenneth W. Borland, Jr.	Dallas Baptist University
Marcie Boucouvalas	Virginia Tech University
Ralph G. Brockett	University of Tennessee at Knoxville
Paula Brook	University of Alberta
Ann Brooks	University of Texas-Austin
Alison Brouse	University of Texas
Rosemary S. Caffarella	University of Northern Colorado
Ronald Cervero	University of Georgia
Barbara Ryan Church	U. S. Department of Justice
M. Carolyn Clark	Texas A&M University
Scipio A. J. Colin, III	North Carolina State University
Dale Cook	Ohio Literacy Resource Center
Peter Cookson	Penn State
Judith L. Cope	California State University
Bradley C. Courtenay	University of Georgia
Michael Day	University of Wyoming
Gary Dean	Indiana University of Pennsylvania
David Deshler	Cornell University
Robert L. Dilworth	Virginia Commonwealth University
John M. Dirkx	University of Nebraska
Larry M. Dooley	Texas A&M University
Jill H. Ellsworth	Southwest Texas State University
Sonia A. Eveslage	Thomas Edison State College
Charlotte Farr	University of Wyoming
Trenton R. Ferro	Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Sarah Jane Fishback	Kansas State University
James C. Fisher	University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee
Daniele Flannery	Penn State - Harrisburg
Tamara Fleming	Project TIME Lord Fairfax Community College
Kevin Freer	Ohio State University
Frank Fuller	Northwestern State University
Nancy Gadbow	SUNY-Empire State College
Michael W. Galbraith	Florida Atlantic University
Randy Garrison	University of Calgary
Linda Gober	South Plains College
Annette Greenland	University of North Carolina at Charlotte
William S. Griffith	University of British Columbia
Lucy Guglielmino	Florida Atlantic University
Ellie Hajek	Texas Woman's University
Elisabeth Hayes	University of Wisconsin - Madison

David Hemphill	San Francisco State University
John A. Henschke	University of Missouri
Roger Hiemstra	Syracuse University
Jay Hochstetler	Indiana Wesleyan University
Suzanne Hubbell	Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission
Paul Ilsley	Northern Illinois University
Waynne James	University of South Florida
Elizabeth Kasl	School for Transformative Learning,
Carol E. Kasworm	University of Tennessee at Knoxville
Thomas J. Kinney	SUNY
Alan B. Knox	University of Wisconsin - Madison
Dennis Lekan	Enterchange Inc.
Carroll A. Londoner	Virginia Commonwealth University
Larry G. Martin	University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee
Robert Mason	Northern Illinois University
Gloria McCormick	Western Michigan University
James H. McElhinney	Ball State University
Athalinda McIntosh	University of Surrey, U.K.
Ronald McKeen	Virginia Tech University
Sylvia McLaurin	University of Georgia
Sharan B. Merriam	University of Georgia
Bernie Moore	University of Georgia
Oma Morey	University of Texas
Roger Morris	Sydney University of Technology
Vivian W. Mott	University of Georgia
Barbara K. Mullins	Memphis State University
Peter J. Murk	Ball State University
Michael Newman	Sydney University of Technology
Robert E. Nolan	Oklahoma State University
Emmalou Norland	Ohio State University
Gerald Normie	
Richard A. Orem	Northern Illinois University
Judith Ottoson	University of British Columbia
Kenneth E. Paprock	Texas A&M University
John Peters	University of Tennessee at Knoxville
Elizabeth Peterson	University of South Carolina
Allan E. Pevoto	Regis University
W. Lee Pierce	University of Southern Mississippi
Cheryl J. Polson	Kansas State University
Allan Quigley	Penn State University - Monroeville
John Rachal	University of Southern Mississippi
Jost Reischmann	University of Tubingen
Russell D. Robinson	University of Wisconsin
Mike Rosato	Dallas Baptist University
Jovita M. Ross-Gordon	Penn State University
Mark H. Rossman	Walden University
Iris Saltiel	Thomas Edison State College
Lorilee R. Sandman	Michigan State University
Fred M. Schied	Penn State University
Don Seaman	Texas A&M University
Vanessa Sheared	San Francisco State University
Ed Simpson	Northern Illinois University
Susan B. Slusarski	Syracuse University
Donna Smith	Defense Systems Management College
Douglas H. Smith	Florida International University
Thomas J. Sork	University of British Columbia
Barbara Sparks	

W. Franklin Spikes	Kansas State University
Harold Stubblefield	Virginia Tech University
Marion E. Sweeney	University of Missouri
Craig D. Swenson	University of Phoenix
Elizabeth J. Tisdell	University of Georgia
Gwendolyn Y. Turner	University of Missouri
Thomas Valentine	University of Georgia
Max Van Der Kamp	University of Groningen
Jim Walter	Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Howard D. Walters	Gulf Coast Research Laboratory
Cheng-Yen Wang	University of London, Institute of Education
Karen Watkins	University of Georgia
Donna Whitson	University of Wyoming
Lavetta E. Wilson	University of Southern Mississippi
Bert Wiswell	Virginia Tech University
Cathy Zeph	University of Utah
Lorraine Zinn	Regis University
Lorrie Zygmont	Temple University

Total: 124

Appendix A

STRENGTHENING UNIVERSITY SUPPORT

FOR

ADULT EDUCATION GRADUATE PROGRAMS

A Report to Members of the Commission of Professors of Adult Education

Ad Hoc Committee

Alan B. Knox, Chair
Rosemary Caffarella
Brad Courtenay
David Deshler
Jovita Ross-Gordon

[April 1993]

STRENGTHENING UNIVERSITY SUPPORT FOR ADULT EDUCATION GRADUATE PROGRAMS

This is a report to members of the Commission of Professors of Adult Education (CPAE) of AAACE. The purpose of the report is to help interested CPAE members (1) respond to short term threats and opportunities within their university, and (2) build long term support and cooperation for their graduate program. Each program has an unique history, context, and combination of strengths and weaknesses. Professors of adult education at each program must address their distinctive circumstances with appropriate strategies. This report many alert CPAE members to widespread issues and potential strategies to consider.

This report is based on the experience and insights of the members of the team that prepared it, on pertinent professional literature, and on phone interviews with professors in more than a dozen other graduate programs. The programs with which the team members and respondents are associated, are fairly representative of the more than six dozen programs in the United States. (The team members from Canada decided to prepare a similar-report for Canadian programs, which they plan to disseminate separately.) The U.S. programs are from all regions of the country, including some private institutions, range in size from one to more than a dozen faculty members, including separate programs and those included in broader departments with other majors such as administration, vocational education, foundations, higher education, instructional technology, and teacher education.

Program Characteristics and Vulnerability

Various program characteristics and institutional influences can be associated with program strength or vulnerability. Included in this section are descriptions of five specific areas to consider when making decisions about programs: faculty, students, image, resources, and administrative relations. The section concludes with major and widespread early symptoms of program vulnerability.

Faculty

Some characteristics of faculty members who teach courses and advise majors in adult education seem to be associated with program vitality and vulnerability. Included are the number of faculty members, the proportion that is full time, perceived status, the proportion that is non-tenured or pre-retirement, extent of scholarly productivity, and relations with other specialties in a combined department. High vulnerability seems to be associated with:

- very few tenure track faculty members
- high proportion of faculty members who are part time or adjunct (which can be offset if they are in powerful positions).
- low perceived status
- high proportion of non-tenured
- high proportion of faculty on non-tenure or soft money lines
- high proportion approaching retirement

- low scholarly productivity
- a combined department in which a majority of members are in other fields and do not value adult education
- departure of the one outstanding faculty member
- faculty members are new and unfamiliar with the institution
- faculty members emphasize their national career and not program building
- little contact with counterparts in other institutions
- faculty members are isolated from their colleagues in adult education and/or closely allied departments or divisions
- personal conflicts and antagonisms among faculty members may overshadow other activities of the productive faculty

Students

Some student characteristics also seem to be associated with program vitality and vulnerability. Included are enrollments, ability, and visibility. High vulnerability seems to be associated with:

- low and declining enrollments that do not justify faculty positions.
- low ability, associated with low admissions standards, limited professional experience, low course grades, and poor performance on research reports.
- low visibility with college faculty and administrators due to part time or off-campus enrollments.
- unclear or very narrowly defined student career opportunities.

Image

A positive program image seems to reflect productive and visible faculty members and students, and program outcomes that benefit the college. High vulnerability seems to be associated with:

- invisibility among people in the college and university in a position to influence program survival and vitality.
- negative image associated with program soundness, student performance, faculty productivity, and external support.
- arrogant, aloof, or critical stance by adult education faculty regarding other program areas in the college.
- adult education program is viewed as more of a support area then a viable program unto itself.
- low involvement by faculty members in key committee work, and faculty governance in general.

Resources

Program vitality seems to be associated with a positive balance between income and expenditure of finances and other resources, such as access to facilities and support. Adverse economic conditions, budget reductions, and related institutional competition for increasingly scarce resources increases stress and can disrupt a formerly satisfactory balance. High vulnerability seems to be associated with:

- low or declining program enrollments and related income
- expanding enrollments beyond resources
- low external grant funds
- program provides little access to resources valued by the college
- especially adverse economic conditions which may result in institutional budget reductions

Administrative Relations

Program vitality seems to be associated with positive relations with university administrators such as provost, dean, and chairs of related departments. Especially during periods of increased competition for scarce university resources, administrators (and especially deans) may refuse to fill needed faculty positions, transfer faculty to other departments, merge adult education with other specializations in a combined department, or try to eliminate the entire program. High vulnerability seems to be associated with:

- a new dean who is not supportive of adult education, in comparison with the previous dean
- a college shift toward school based certification programs
- an ambitious chair of a related department
- perception by administrators that adult education is a low priority area
- image of low program quality and productivity
- perception in related departments that the adult education program is critical of other program areas in the college, aloof, or at least not integral to their mission

Early Symptoms of Vulnerability

Some early indicators of increased program vulnerability occurred at a number of institutions. As the number and negativeness of the following symptoms increases, the more vulnerable the program becomes:

- low faculty productivity
- large proportion of faculty approaching retirement or leaving for other reasons
- low or declining enrollments and dropping standards to compensate
- lack of support from related departments or specializations
- declining university budgets
- a new, less supportive dean or other major administrator

Strategies for Increasing Support

Various strategies have been used to increase long term university support and cooperation. Such strategies are composed of components such as leadership, program quality, stakeholders, and institutional values-each of which are discussed below. The report concludes with some examples of strategies that are responsive to threats and characteristics in some contrasting settings, to illustrate why strategies to build institutional support must be tailored to the specific context.

Leadership

Energy and leadership is required by adult education program or department chair and faculty members to have both a strong program and sufficient institutional support. All categories of Department stakeholders can contribute time and effort to this leadership. Included are faculty, students, staff, alumni, faculty in related departments and programs, university administrators (especially when they change), and external stakeholders such as practitioners and policy makers related to the field. Vision, planning, communication, interdependence, and shared benefits are important ingredients in such leadership.

Quality

An excellent program is clearly the foundation on which to build institutional support. However, there are some aspects of program quality that are especially important and some ways to capitalize on excellence to win and maintain support. Important aspects include strong faculty scholarship (including major publications and external funding), effective teaching and learning for able students, program offerings that are responsive to emerging demand from the field (such as the HRD specializations), a clear definition of mission and the distinctive contribution of adult education, and effective planning. But an excellent program is insufficient. Usually concerted efforts to communicate and interpret the program to internal as well as external stakeholders are necessary if the program is to have a clear and positive image. Personal contact, newsletters, and cooperative ventures all can help enhance program image. Contact with graduate programs in other institutions can help.

Stakeholders

Strengthening internal support usually entails winning and maintaining cooperation with both internal and external stakeholders. Sustained cooperation reflects mutually beneficial exchanges with other partners. Such stakeholders include students, alumni, and practitioners as well as college faculty and administrators. Sometimes, external stakeholders (such as alumni, practitioners, and policy makers) can be more persuasive with university administrators than can program faculty and students. Students have a major stake in program success, and in addition to enrollment trends and academic performance they can increase internal support if their interactions with administrators and influential faculty members in the college are enthusiastic, supportive, well-timed, and constructive. Demand for graduates is important and can be a major asset. There are various ways to strengthen support from faculty members in related departments and programs. Included are: broadening the courses in other departments taken by adult education majors, attracting students from other departments; including faculty members from related departments in adult education projects and student research committees; adult education faculty serving on university committees; contributing to teacher certification programs; and integration of programs in combined departments instead of mergers that silence. The common theme is interdependence that builds solidarity among stakeholders.

Values

In general, institutional support for an adult education graduate program reflects a congruence between the program and university values. Achieving such congruence entails dealing with power relations and organizational culture. Assuming preservation of program integrity and of ethical practices, a program can emphasize what the university values, and this varies from institution to institution. Examples include increasing: enrollments, external grant support (without overdependence), access to policy makers, alumni gifts, cooperation with related departments, student achievement, and teaching awards.

Contingencies and Strategies

Effective strategies to strengthen university support for adult education graduate programs address the distinctive contingencies in the specific situation (history, context, combination of strengths and weaknesses). Following are several somewhat fictionalized examples of specific contingencies and responsive strategies.

ALPHA - When the most prominent professor of adult education left, a combination of internal weaknesses and external threats almost ended the program. The remaining faculty members were approaching retirement, had been aloof and critical regarding other programs in the college, and had been complacent about their own program which was losing enrollments inspite of admitting all applicants. When another department chair proposed to absorb or eliminate the adult education program, the college dean initially agreed.

The strategy for increasing support within the college included persuasive advocacy by students in the program regarding its value to them and society, and strong support by alumni who talked with other university administrators who talked with the dean. The program did become part of another department

with a supportive chair, clarified its mission with an emphasis on serving segments of the field that were valued and complementary, raised admission standards, and increased interaction between faculty and students in the program and those in related departments. Improved momentum and image resulted.

BETA - The program consisted of a few young untenured faculty members who were unfamiliar with institutional dynamics. Program enrollments were low, and the professors of adult education devoted most of their energies to program building, relations to the field to increase enrollments, and preparation for promotion and tenure. The chairs of the division that included the program was not very supportive, and the program was perceived as tangential to the K-12 mission of the college.

The strategy for increasing support included both interpersonal relations and rationale for the program as integral to the mission of the college. The program faculty members increased their emphasis on working with colleagues in related departments through governance committees, joint dissertation and research activities, providing teacher preparation courses, increasing enrollments of majors and non-majors, involving administrators, and starting an advisory committee.

GAMMA - In spite of general university retrenchment, the adult education department experienced some expansion. This reflected some internal reductions of program offerings for which there was limited or declining demand. At the same time, the program implemented a detailed plan to greatly expand the staff development program area that was not emphasized at competing institutions and for which there was strong demand and support in the field. Faculty members in related departments agreed to teach courses and to serve on student committees, in addition to the main program building and advising by professors of adult education. Representatives from enterprises served as strong advocates for this program expansion. The program marketed the specialty effectively, including offering courses at outreach locations. However, some balance of off campus and on campus enrollments was maintained because of the visibility and benefits to related departments of on campus enrollments. External funding was obtained but not to the extent that soft money support for faculty positions made them vulnerable.

These three examples illustrate the differing circumstances and strategies that selected suggestions in the total report should be used for. Such selection and adaptation is essential for effective organizational change. Fortunately, concepts regarding change are part of the content of adult education, which graduate programs can use in their strategic planning.

Ad hoc Committee
Rosemary Caffarella
Brad Courtenay
David Deshler
Alan B. Knox (Chair)
Jovita Ross-Gordon

Summary of Interviews with CPAE Institutions

B. Allan Quigley
Penn State University

Interviews of adult education faculty at several institutions were conducted in 1992-93 by the "Knox Committee," an ad hoc committee charged by the CPAE with gathering information useful for strengthening university support of adult education graduate programs. The material below was prepared for the *Proceedings* by Allan Quigley, who, after consultation with Alan Knox and with the copy-editing assistance of Rosemary Caffarella and Ralph Brockett, sought to protect confidentiality by deleting references to the identities of interviewees and their employing institutions.

The following summary represents comments from faculty members in five geographically dispersed adult education graduate programs, and may be seen as exemplary of the feelings of faculty and administrators in adult education graduate programs. The observations are categorized into two major areas, with some overlap: **indicators** of problems and issues related to adult education graduate programs, and **strategies** adult education faculty have used or would suggest that others use in building support for programs.

Indicators of Problems/Issues

1. Issues related to faculty

   a. Program has low number of faculty.

   b. Faculty are isolated from their colleges and/or national contacts and associations.

   c. Majority of faculty are untenured faculty or on "soft money."

   d. Program has a number of faculty who are recent hires or are coming up for retirement.

   e. The program has only one "star" faculty member and that person leaves or retires.

   f. The majority of faculty are relatively new to higher education or to a particular campus, and are not attuned or do not know how to enter the politically connected networks on that campus.

   g. There are personal conflicts between and among faculty both internal and external to the department.

   h. One or more faculty members of the department have alienated themselves from other faculty through their behavior/activities (professional and/or personal).

2. Issues related to the adult education program

   a. Enrollments are low.

   b. A drop in enrollments has occurred.

c. Composition of dissertation committees reflects an over-reliance on only two or three support areas and, even more problematically, on only a few individuals within those support areas.

d. Support is lacking from the chair of the department or division in which the program is housed.

e. Faculty members in adult education are "out of the loop" of decision-making within their own departments or colleges (*e. g.*, the dean's advisory council consists only of people who are oriented to the public schools).

f. The adult education program becomes more of a support service than a major in the college.

g. There are too many students for the number of faculty, possibly raising questions of quality.

h. Faculty place most, if not all, of their major energy on national recognition for themselves (*e. g.*, publications, association work, consulting) and very little time and effort in working with the academic program.

i. The program curriculum becomes outdated.

j. The student market for the program is unclear and/or too narrow.

k. The adult education program is not seen as an important part of the mission of the college in which it is housed (*e. g.*, in colleges of education where the focus is K-12 education and adult education is seen as a "fringe").

l. The workload internal to the program is so heavy that no time is allowed for recruitment efforts (suggesting that adult education is not a priority area).

3. <u>Issues in the adult education program's relationships with other units on campus</u> (divisions, departments, colleges, central administration)

a. Faculty in the adult education program have isolated themselves from other units on campus.

b. Faculty in the adult education unit are overly critical of other units.

c. Faculty in other units are overly critical of the adult education faculty.

d. Involvement by adult education faculty is low on dissertation committees in other units (especially when AE faculty are not seen as having expertise useful to those other units).

e. Involvement of adult education faculty is low on key committees of the division, college and university--however these are defined at the local campus--and in faculty governance in general.

f. Other units lack understanding of the adult education program, especially when resources are tight or nonexistent.

g. Faculty are not in the political loop or the "horse trading" that goes on between and among units.

4. Institution-wide concerns and problems

a. Resource issues, especially related to finances, are prominent.

b. The "rules" change at the university concerning governance and/or criteria for faculty "success," especially when related to promotion and tenure.

c. There is a change in leadership at the top.

d. There is a campus-wide lack of understanding of the adult education program.

e. The adult education program is not seen as part of the major mission of the university, especially when there is a change in the mission statement of the university.

f. There are major changes at the institutional level but members of the department are not "politically connected" to those in the decision-making roles.

g. Changes in legislative action (state and national) occur that will have an effect on the institution (its policies, financial base).

5. Issues of connections to the field of adult education

a. Faculty are not active in CPAE, AERC, and other national associations and groups where other adult education faculty are involved.

b. Faculty are isolated from colleagues (practitioners or professors) at the field's state, regional, and national levels.

Strategies for Building Support

1. Strategies for adult education faculty

a. Individual faculty members become involved with other faculty and staff across campus in ways that are helpful both to the individual faculty member and the department.

b. Faculty become involved in the "political arena" through committee work, faculty governance, etc.

c. Faculty are willing to *be* "political"--to act in a political manner and use political strategies.

d. Faculty are willing to work across departments on dissertations and in other research activities.

e. Faculty view themselves in terms of the wider educational community--*i. e.*, as professional educators, not just professional *adult* educators.

f. Faculty use adult-educator skills in critical reflection, to be helpful and thus an asset to other faculty (*e. g.*, K-12) groups.

g. Faculty work in collegial and collaborative styles (in contrast to focusing just on solo activities).

2. Strategies related to the adult education program

a. Adult education programs in colleges of education join with the efforts in K-12 education; AE faculty become an integrated and valuable part of that endeavor by taking leadership roles on K-12-related issues and committees.

b. Adult education program faculty work closely with other faculty across divisions, colleges, and other units to build support bases for both faculty and students (*e. g.*, for teaching, dissertation research, faculty research projects).

c. Faculty seek common interests/expertise *and* differences between and among other faculty in other units in order to capitalize on those differences adult educators have to offer to other units.

d. Program builds a core of strong and visible students.

e. Program faculty/staff develop and maintain a strong market for the program.

f. Strong class enrollments are maintained through such strategies as student recruitment and class scheduling.

g. Program is persistent as a unit, "hanging in there" even if extra work is required when "times are tough" in terms of providing quality programs.

h. Faculty in the program use links to supportive alumni and present students who are connected into important networks both internal and external to the university.

i. Faculty make the case to major decision-makers that no college of education is complete without adult education, especially in view of changing demographics, workplace needs, and markets.

j. Faculty/staff develop and maintain an ongoing data file (preferably quantitative--*e. g.*, class enrollments, program enrollments, placement records, changes in jobs) which can demonstrate the program's viability.

k. Program builds and uses wisely a strong advisory group.

l. Program works to reshape the image of adult education so that a fit--a very explicit fit--can be seen between the program and the mission of the college in which it is housed.

m. A concerted effort is made to move "soft money" positions into hard-line tenure-track positions.

n. Faculty build a track record of grant support, but do not allow this to become the major support for the department.

o. Faculty are attentive to changes in the local and national arena pertaining to adult education, and willing to make timely, academically sound curriculum changes.

3. Strategies for the program's relationship to other campus units

a. Items 2-a, 2-b, 2-c and 2-i (above) relate both to the adult education program itself and its relationships with other units on campus.

b. Faculty become and stay involved in key faculty governance committees and issues; this allows for visibility across campus.

c. Faculty ensure that adult education interests are voiced in decision-making efforts between and among campus units.

d. Faculty build grant support with other units as part of cross-discipline/program efforts.

4. Strategies at the institutional level

a. If there is a change at the top, faculty make sure--through already established networks--that adult education as an important area is understood.

b. Where appropriate, program faculty involve new administrators in program activities (*e. g.*, as guest speakers in classes, as guests formally invited to all special events).

c. Faculty proactively acquire clear picture (if there is one) of new campus priorities, policies, procedures, mission, etc.

d. Faculty proactively respond to changes in legislation affecting the campus and/or the field at state and national levels.

5. Strategies related to the field of adult education

a. Faculty develop and maintain active participation in CPAE, AERC, AAACE and other appropriate professional organizations.

b. Faculty develop and/or maintain networks with colleagues in adult education at state, regional and national levels.

c. Faculty establish national and/or international reputations for program quality and viability, continually publicizing them.

Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Education (CASAE) and the
Commission of Professors of Adult Education (CPAE)

STRENGTHENING UNIVERSITY SUPPORT FOR ADULT EDUCATION GRADUATE PROGRAMS: WESTERN CANADIAN PERSPECTIVES

by

Thomas J. Sork
The University of British Columbia
November, 1993

With thanks to colleagues at Western Canadian universities who agreed to be interviewed and whose ideas and observations provided the basis for this report.

This report is part of a joint effort by the Committee of Professors of the Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Education and the Commission of Professors of Adult Education of the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education to strengthen the support provided to adult education graduate programs in Canada and the U.S. It is based on the views of colleagues from six universities located in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia that offer, or are in the process of offering, graduate study in adult education. The purpose of the project was to gather information that may help faculty in graduate programs respond to short-term internal threats and to build and maintain long-term support for their programs. An earlier report (dated April 7, 1993), based on interviews with colleagues from U.S. universities, has been distributed to members of the Commission of Professors and will be discussed at the annual meeting of the CPAE in Dallas, Texas along with this report.

Current Status of Graduate Programs in Western Canada

There are no free-standing departments of adult education in Western Canada. Every graduate program is contained within a department that includes other fields of study. Most often these other fields are—in some combination—educational administration, educational foundations, higher education, community education, and career and technical education. During the last 3 years in Western Canada, opportunities to study adult education at the undergraduate and graduate level have increased: one new masters program has been approved, another is in the process of being approved; a B.A. in adult education is under development; and certificate- and diploma-level programs have expanded.

The number of faculty in these programs ranges from one to seven. Some established graduate programs have lost faculty to retirements, experienced awkward reorganizations, and lost supportive deans or department heads while others have added staff, refocused their programs and consolidated support. On balance, graduate study in Western Canada can best be characterized as *stable*, although there are some exceptions that will be noted below. The demand for graduate study in adult education is clearly increasing at a time when university funding is either stable or declining.

Recent Threats

Although some respondents considered *"threats"* too active a word to label what they had experienced, faculty found themselves in various circumstances that caused them to be concerned about the future of their programs. Following are the main "threats" faced by these programs.

- **Financial pressure to cut programs or faculty.** Cutbacks in university funding make it difficult to sustain higher-cost graduate programs. Cutbacks make it difficult to replace retiring faculty members and a higher priority is often given to teacher education programs which are viewed as more central to the mission of the College or Faculty. Since adult education graduate programs are relatively small and are not working in areas considered directly related to a K-12 mission, they are vulnerable when a dean is asked to cut positions or programs.

- **Proposed reorganization.** Often related to financial pressure, reorganizations are proposed to reduce administrative overhead and to "broaden" the intellectual base of a department. They also effectively dilute the influence of some faculty and increase the influence of others. Reorganizations are also viewed as one solution to internal squabbling and dissention because they invariably alter the dynamics of debate and decision making.

- **Dissention among faculty.** Fundamental—and often very public—disagreements among adult education faculty and between adult education faculty and others in the department or college are threats because they divert energy from teaching and research programs; sometimes embarrass administrators who view them as *"problem programs";* and become the focus of attention for current and prospective students, other faculty, and those in the field who may offer support. Scholarly work being done in the program by faculty and students is overshadowed by the bickering, disagreements and ideological warfare.

- **Confusing the field of practice with the field of study.** Adult education as a field of study is not only difficult to describe but it is largely invisible to others in the College or Faculty who focus on the preparation of teachers and administrators for schools. Those who do not make a conceptual distinction between the field of practice and the field of study will not appreciate the research traditions and contributions to scholarship that are rewarded in universities. In some quarters there are still doubts about the legitimacy of adult education as a field of study.

- **New dean or department head.** The departure of a supportive dean or department head and the arrival of a non-supportive or ill-informed replacement represents a threat since new administrators often feel the urge to put their own *"stamp"* on the unit by reorganizing it or changing its orientation. Such changes do, of course, represent opportunities to build new alliances and realign a program so that the new administrator can support and defend it. Nevertheless, any change in key decision-makers is likely to alter the priorities of the unit and the way it is administered.

Strategies Used to Build and Maintain Support

- **Develop internal strategic alliances.** Adult education programs are generally considered lower priority within their College or Faculty than school-oriented teacher education programs. Strategic alliances are used to build support for adult education programs in a context where its contribution to the mission of the College or Faculty may be questioned. Building these alliances involves

developing more or less formal cooperative relationships with academic units both within and outside the College or Faculty. Depending on the history and emphasis of the program, outside units might include Extension or Continuing Education, Agriculture, Social Work, Business/Commerce, Health Professions, and so on. Developing *mutually-beneficial dependencies* with other units not only raises the profile of adult education, but also links its continued health with the health of the other units.

- **Develop external strategic alliances.** Graduate study in adult education developed from the concerns and with the support of the field of practice. Developing and maintaining alliances with key groups and individuals in the field of practice has worked to the advantage of several programs by providing a constant flow of experienced graduate students, sites for research and field placements, and a source of support when programs are threatened. Again, the concept of *mutually-beneficial dependencies* applies; the alliances must be seen to benefit both the external group and the adult education program.

- **Cultivate support among key decision makers.** Key decision makers include department heads, deans, and vice presidents, all of whom are involved in allocating resources to programs—and threats to programs typically involve decisions to re-allocate resources. Keeping these people informed of the role, direction and accomplishments of the adult education program is viewed as important because these programs generally have a low profile within their College or Faculty and are doing work which is often not considered directly relevant to the teacher education function (or other primary function) of the unit. Adult education programs can easily become isolated/marginalized unless energy is put into building a stable base of support. From the cases included in this report, the programs which seemed to consider this an important strategy relied on the personal relationships that had been cultivated by one or more faculty with deans, vice-presidents and other key decision makers.

- **Involve non-adult education faculty on supervisory committees.** Related to developing internal alliances, this strategy is used to broaden awareness among other faculty of the kind of work being done in adult education and to demonstrate the abilities and perspectives of adult education graduate students. The success of this strategy depends, of course, on having well-prepared students who are knowledgeable about educational developments both within and outside adult education and adult education faculty who are similarly aware and who are willing to take the risk of having "outsiders" evaluate the work of their students and the perspectives on research and scholarship that characterize the field.

- **Publicize accomplishments.** This strategy is another response to the relatively low visibility of adult education programs. Since faculty and students outside of adult education rarely attend our research conferences, read our journals and books, or know much about our scholarship or professional practice, our accomplishments can easily go unrecognized. Making others aware of these accomplishments is an important strategy for raising the profile of adult education by demonstrating that faculty and students are active scholars and talented practitioners who are recognized as such by their peers. This process includes publicizing awards received, research grants/contracts acquired, publications produced, conference presentations made, exemplary programs developed, and so on.

Indicators of Vulnerability

So far this report has considered the kinds of threats faced by graduate programs and strategies these programs have used to respond. In this section indicators of program vulnerability, drawn from the experience and reflections of respondents, are described with the hope that they will stimulate self-analysis and discussion within programs.

- **Loss of key faculty.** Retirement, resignation or reassignment of faculty who have provided leadership and/or balance to programs increases vulnerability because they create opportunities to reallocate resources and to eliminate positions. Programs with few faculty are especially vulnerable because the departure from a small program of one or two faculty makes it easy to justify elimination of the program. If faculty are reassigned/dispersed to other academic units, then programs are vulnerable because there is no *"core group"* to defend them and because the dynamics of decision making change in favour of larger programs which are viewed as more central to the mission of the College or Faculty. Retiring faculty also take with them whatever influence, respect and credibility that is connected to their personalities and scholarship. If these are not *"replaced"* in the program, then the program becomes more vulnerable.

- **Low enrollment/low graduation rate.** Small programs that attract few students or graduate a small proportion of those who do enrol are vulnerable to elimination, especially in those institutions that use a *"portfolio analysis"* approach to resource allocation. In this approach programs that serve small or highly specialized *"markets"* are vulnerable unless serving these markets is considered central to the mission. Low graduation rates suggest either low program quality or that the market is not being well-served. In either case, programs become more vulnerable because they do not represent areas of potential growth, high demand or high quality—any of which would argue for continued support.

- **Low admission standards/high acceptance rate.** Most graduate programs are subject to minimum admission criteria established by a senate, a faculty of graduate studies or other such body. Programs that are more *"selective"*—meaning that they admit only a portion of those who satisfy the minimum criteria—are often held in higher esteem and are viewed as higher quality than those who admit all or most of those who apply. Adult education programs become vulnerable if those who make resource allocation decisions come to view them as less demanding or challenging than other programs in the College or Faculty. Although adult education programs are often heavily populated with mature students who have proven themselves more academically capable than their undergraduate records would suggest, there are those in the university who view a *"selective"* admissions approach much more positively than an *"open"* approach. The degree to which admission practices influence vulnerability is most likely dependent on whether key decision makers view graduate education from an egalitarian or an elitist perspective, so it is important to understand which perspective is held by department heads, deans, vice-presidents and others in key decision-making positions.

- **Low faculty commitment to field of study.** As a multidisciplinary field, adult education programs are often staffed by faculty with a variety of disciplinary backgrounds and interests. There are many advantages of this, but one disadvantage is that faculty allegiances are often to their primary disciplines rather than to adult education as a field of study. This seems to happen most often with faculty who have their academic training in another field or discipline and find

themselves affiliated with an adult education program later in their careers. Low faculty commitment to and involvement in the field of study can result in teaching and research only marginally relevant to extant concerns and issues. While there are many examples where those trained in another field or discipline joined and became fully committed to adult education, there are also examples where there was a low level of commitment because the original field or discipline was considered the primary academic *"home"* which could be reoccupied if things did not work out in adult education.

- **Low or invisible scholarly productivity.** Respect and relative stability are the rewards for programs with high levels of scholarly productivity. Programs with low or invisible scholarly productivity are vulnerable because they are viewed as not contributing fully to the mission of a research-oriented university. Unless such programs provide an essential service function for other academic units—which is rare in the case of adult education graduate programs—they are vulnerable to cuts or to reorganizations designed to *"reinvigorate"* the scholarly interests and activities of faculty and students.

- **Internal squabbling/ideological warfare.** Academic life in North America seems to encourage individualism and the development of well-reasoned and vigorously-defended ideological stances. In one respect these enliven the academic environment and lead to new insights and understandings wrought from debate and disagreement. Yet when it comes to building support for graduate programs, the very characteristics that make the university a stimulating place to work can make it nearly impossible to reach agreement on required collective action. Programs become vulnerable when faculty are unable to reach consensus on directions, policies and strategies necessary to build and maintain a program. Personal and professional animosities, when played out publicly, become thorns in the sides of key decision makers, put students in the uncomfortable position of having to *"choose sides"* to make any progress in their programs, and demonstrate to the academic community that the group cannot govern itself. In such circumstances, programs become vulnerable to reorganizations designed to distance the warring factions, to outright dissolution, or to placement in a unit under the supervision of someone thought able to either referee the contest or to make decisions for the group since they cannot make decisions for themselves.

- **Poor relations with the field of practice.** Scholarship that results in refereed publications and attracts research grants remains the most valued form of work in universities, so those responding to the reward structure would devote most of their energies to grant getting and writing for publication. And yet the experience in Western Canada suggests that building and maintaining good relations with the field of practice reduces vulnerability while poor relations increases vulnerability. Poor relations with the field of practice make it difficult to get outside support if the program is threatened and may also affect the quality and number of applicants. Several instances were described where support from the field of practice was rallied to convince various decision makers that a position should be filled, that a program should *not* be discontinued or reorganized, or that additional resources were justified because the program was making significant contributions to improved practice. Since practitioners are the primary clients of adult education graduate programs, a program viewed as irrelevant, unresponsive or aloof from the concerns of practice may also have problems recruiting talented students.

- **Poor or uneven student/faculty relations.** Students are an important source of political support for graduate programs. Satisfied students who are helped to achieve their academic goals in a safe, supportive and challenging environment can be potent lobbyists within the university. But students who are ill-served by their advisors, who are subject to second-rate teaching, who are exposed to outdated or irrelevant ideas, or who feel harassed or threatened by faculty can be equally potent in expressing their discontent with the program. Programs become vulnerable when they do not maintain positive student/faculty relations because they are viewed as *"problems."* Poor student/faculty relations, when combined with other indicators of vulnerability, can be used to justify eliminating or reconfiguring programs to solve *"the problem."*

- **Insularity from other academic units.** Some adult education programs pride themselves on their *"uniqueness"* and the fundamental differences they claim distinguish their programs, students and scholarship from those units which focus on other forms and levels of education. The case for uniqueness has its roots in the need to justify separate programs and units devoted to adult education in a setting where many scholars are interested in educational issues. But one consequence of winning this argument—and repeating it when circumstances warrant—is that adult education programs have insulated themselves from the *"evil"* influences of other academic units to the point where there is little interchange of ideas and a jealous guarding of students from competing paradigms and value positions. Such insularity makes programs vulnerable not only because they are seen as isolated—and therefore easy to eliminate or reconfigure without consequence for other programs—but also because they may be viewed by those outside as ideologically monolithic with little to offer the wider educational community.

- **Little regard for building/maintaining internal base of support.** Complacency regarding building support for adult education graduate programs is cause for concern even if enrollments are healthy, students are satisfied, and faculty are busy getting published and acquiring grants. Building and maintaining support is a continuous and deliberate process that requires planning and energy. Programs become vulnerable when it is assumed that, because everything seems to be going well, there is no need to worry about cultivating relationships with decision makers and maintaining a base of support. A related problem is having only one person involved in this work. It is a problem because if something happens to that person, the base of support may have to be reconstructed from scratch. Personal relationships do seem to be the most common foundation on which support is built, but these take time and constant attention to maintain. Engaging successfully in university politics depends on developing trust, gaining and maintaining academic credibility, providing timely and useful information, demonstrating a future-oriented perspective, and recognizing that adult education is only one program among many with legitimate claims on limited resources.

Recommendations

Following are some general recommendations concerning how adult education graduate programs might reasonably respond to the ideas presented in this report. They are based on the proposition that no program—regardless of its history, size, prestige or location—is completely secure in this time of shrinking university budgets, shifting priorities, and competition among educational providers. This proposition has been reinforced numerous times in Canada and the US in the last few years during which major programs have been eliminated or substantially reconfigured. Quality of academic work,

size, grant getting ability, noteworthy specializations and prestige, even when taken together, have not been sufficient to ward off major unwanted changes.

1. **Understand the ways in which a program is vulnerable.** It may be possible to construct a rough and highly-subjective *"vulnerability index"* that reflects the degree of risk to a program based on where it stands on each indicator described above, and others considered important for each institution. Every program exists in a unique context. Characteristics that make a program vulnerable in one context may be irrelevant or inconsequential in another. The important point is to reflect on the unique circumstances of each program and come to some conclusions about where your program might be most vulnerable.

2. **Develop strategies to reduce vulnerability.** Once areas of vulnerability are understood it becomes possible to develop strategies intended to strengthen support. The strategies noted above that were used in specific circumstances in Western Canada may be a starting point for planning a strategy for your own program. Again, each program's context is unique, so what worked in one setting may not work for you. It is important to develop feasible plans that everyone associated with the program is either supportive of or, at minimum, not resistant to.

3. **Decide on the best way to implement and sustain the strategies.** Implementing the strategies and sustaining them will take energy that could be spent doing other things more rewarding or enjoyable, but it is energy invested in the future of the program. In programs with more than one faculty member, placing the entire burden on one person seems unwise since the impact can be greater if all those associated with the program take some responsibility. This will also reduce the likelihood of finger-pointing and blame-laying if the strategies do not produce the desired results. In one-person programs there is not much choice; either that person does the work or it does not get done.

4. **Plan to periodically reassess program vulnerability and take necessary action.** As circumstances change and you find that some strategies work while others do not, it will be useful to reassess program vulnerability and alter strategies. Making this a part of an annual internal program review, keyed to other recurring events like course scheduling, will increase the likelihood that it will get done.

5. **Ask colleagues in CASAE and CPAE for assistance.** One of the purposes of conducting this study was to provide the two cooperating organizations with ideas about how they might assist members in their efforts to strengthen support for adult education graduate programs. Members of these two groups have experienced vulnerability and can offer assistance to others in understanding why programs become vulnerable and what can be done to strengthen support before unwanted changes occur.

We have learned from experience that once a decision about a program's elimination or reconfiguration is made, it is very difficult to reverse. There has been some success in *delaying* implementation of a decision, but it is a rare instance when letters of support, phone calls, and offers to discuss alternative solutions have resulted in decisions being reconsidered or reversed. The implication of this is clear—understanding vulnerabilities and taking action to strengthen support are best thought of as proactive activities because they surely do little good as responses to undesirable decisions.

Appendix B

1993 ANNUAL REPORT OF DOCTORATES CONFERRED IN ADULT EDUCATION

Compiled by
Diane A. Lund and Robert C. Mason
Northern Illinois University

Ball State University

Begovich, Ray
Planning and Implementing Writing Coach Programs at Small Newspapers

Merrill, Henry
A Multicase Study of the Employment and Career Patterns and Intentional Change Strategies of Adults Who Completed a Nontraditional Bachelors Degree

Indiana University

Carlson, Dorothy
Psychosocial Deterrents Related to Nonparticipation of Registered Nurses in Baccalaureate Nursing Degree Programs

Iowa State University

Sneller, Lowell
The Effects of Training: A Model for Mediating Abstract Statistical Concepts

Vogelsang, Maria Renate
Transformative Experiences of Female Adult Students

Montana State University

Kelker, Katharin A.
Individual Differences and Equity Attitude Scale: Measurement of Attitudes Toward the Accommodation of Individual Differences.

Mulrine, Christopher F.
A Descriptive Case Study of Learning Abilities of College Students Who Experiences Childhood Maltreatment.

Yabui, Alan E.
Reflective Judgment and the Adult Learner's Use of Metacognitive Learning Strategies

Northern Illinois University

Baber, James
A Policy of Titles I-IV of the Higher Education Act of 1992: The Fiscal Impact on Adult African-American College Students

Balog, J. Kevin
Chief Executive Peer Groups: A Case Study in Action Learning

Batmangelich, Sorush
A Model Development Integrating Quality Standards in Continuing Medical Education With the Patient Evaluation and Conference System (PECS) to Improve Patient Care

Beckstrom, Edward
A Heuristic Study of the Experiencing of Blocking Creativity: Explorations Toward a New Research Model for Adult Education

Braden, Warren
Homies: A Study of Peer-Mentoring Among African-American Males in Chicago in Relation to Adult Education.

Bruhn, Gay
Women's Voices: A Model Derived From the Experience of Women Returning to the Classrooms of Higher Education.

Dortch, Sammie
From Silence to Roar: African American Men Reclaiming the Discourse from the Margin and the Implications for Adult Education

Eyer, Jane
Self-Directed Continuing Learning Characteristics and Perceptions of Professional Autonomy in Senior Baccalaureate Nursing Students

Guy, Talmadge
Prophecy From the Periphery: Alain Locke's Philosophy of Cultural Pluralism and Adult Education

Hardersen, Alan
Matriculation of Adult General Educational Development Completors to the Community College: A Case Study.

Kamwengo, Martin
An Ethnomethodological Study of the Self-Evaluation Experiences of Adult Learners in a Two-Year College Nursing Program

Langston, Irma
The Effect of Team Teaching on the Acquisition of Word Processing Skills by Adult Learners

LaPaglia, Nancy
Story-tellers: The Image of the Two-Year College in American Fiction and in "Insider" Journals

Patton, Deborah Lee
A Case Study of a Community College's Occupational Program Coordinator's Commitment(s) to Participating in Community Education Offerings as Instructors

Rydland, Inge
Adult Education as Realization of Development: A Critical Study of Development Paradigms in Ethiopa

Saret, Laura
Full-time Faculty Perceptions of Faculty Development Programs in Northern Illinois Suburban Community Colleges

Shriver, Kay A
A Study of A Pre-Employment Assessment Process Used to Select Part-Time Faculty for an Allied Health Degree Completion Program

Tysl, Linda
Cross Gender Mentoring of Successful Women Managers in the United States Government: Toward a Female Model of Mentoring

Wan Mamat, Wan Shamsuddin
Strategic Program Planning and Curriculum Development: A Human Resource Development Model for Kolej Agama Sultan Zainal Abidin

Watson, Marian
An Empirical Study of the Relationship Between Vital Longevity, Longer Retirement Years and Repression.

Weber, Sara
The Contested Terrain: A Review of Federal Adult Education Literacy Legislaton 1962-1991

Pennsylvania State - Harrisburg Capital College

DeWane, Claudia
Self Help Groups and Adult Learning

Whitmore, Robert
Identifying the Continuing Education Needs of Prison Administrators Through the Process of Task Analysis

Pennsylvania State University - University Park

Davis, Ruth
A Phenomenological Study of Adult Puerto Rican Women's Health Reliefs and Health Reliefs and Health Practices: Implications for Adult Educators in Health Care Settings

Huber, Kay
The Extent of Educational Programming and Perceived Importance of Educational Goals for Residents in the Nursing Home Level of Care in Continuing Care Retirement Communities

Manzo, David
Socialization Outcomes of Part-Time Master of Social Work Programs: A Comparison of Returning Adult Students in Career Transition with Returning Adult Students with Undergraduate Training and Practical Experience in Social Work

Sperry-Mauger, Natalie
Deterrents to Physician Participation in Formal Continuing Professional Education

The Pennsylvania State University

Carlson, Dorothy
An Examination of the Dispositional or Psychosocial Barriers of Registered Nurses that Prevent Their Interest in a Baccalaureate Degree in Nursing Program

Wortham, Forest
An Examination of Program Planning in Management Career Development Programs in Corporations: The Theory Practice Dimension

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminar

Subagyo, Andreas Bambang
An Analysis of Indonesian Baptist Urban Religious Professional's Intention to Participate in Con Professional Education and It's Relation to Selected Psychological Predicator Variables and to Their Participation

Syracuse University

Eastmond, Daniel
Adult Learning of Distance Students Through Computer Conferencing

Texas Woman's University

Hamblen, Betty
Effects of Task Requirements, Organizational, Managerial, and Personal Characteristics on Turnover of Registered Nurses in a Hospital

Universite de Montreal

Bamba, Mory
L'alphabetisation Des Adultes En Cote D'Ivoire: Les Facteurs Des Abandons De Cours

Baribeau, Colette
L'enseignement D'un Geste Professionel En Milieu Universitaire

Desjardins, Richard
La Perception Du Professionnalisme Chez Le Personnel Enseignant Et Chez Les Membres De La Direction Des Ecoles Franco-Ontariennes

Fonkoua, Pierre
Finalites De L'education Et Prospective: Elements De Consensus Pour Le Systeme D'education Camerounais

Lebel, Celine
L'autonomie De L'etudiant A Distance: Representations Discursives De Tuteurs

Moffet, Jean-Denis
Effets D'Un Modele D'Enseignement Et D'aide A L'Ecriture Sur Le Transfert De L'Habilete D'Ecrire Au Collegial

Potvin, Micheline
L'impact Des Technologies Du Traitement De L'information a Des Fins De Gestion Sur La Conception Que Les Gestionnaires Entretiennent De Leur Role

Senecal, Huguette
L'analphabetisme Fonctionnel Chez Les Eleves En Cheminement Particulier De Formation

Tardif, Marc
L'employabilite Des Juenes Adultes En Difficulte' D'adaptation Et D'apprentissage, Opinions D'enseignants Et D'Employeurs

Toupin, Louis
Le Transfert De Connaissances, Un Modele Pour La Formation Des Adultes

University of Arkansas - Fayetteville

Atkinson, Jimmy
Faculty Perceptions of Teaching Styles at Three Selected Northwest Arkansas Post-Secondary Institutions and How They Relate to the Andragogical Model

Barry, Linda
Diabetics and Tobacco Use: The Effect of Knowledge on Affective Behavior

Barta, Kathleen
Information Seeking, Research Utilization, and Perceived Barriers to Research Utilization of Pediatric Nurse Educators

Carder, Sarah
A Study of the Factors that Influence the Corporate Decision to Participate In Employee Training and the Identification of Future Training Needs

Harris, Gail
A Study of Computer-Assisted Instruction for Reading Achievement in College Reading Improvement Courses

Holt, Nola
An Assessment of the Impact of Cultural Diversity Training on the Attitudes of Arkansas Business, Industry, and Community Leaders

Price, Loretta
Colonization, Civilization, Christianization: An Ethnohistorical Study of the Foundation of American Education

Royster, Nola
An Assessment of the Impact of Cultural Diversity Training on the Attitudes of Arkansas Business, Industry, and Community Leaders

Starr, Donna
The Affects of Learning Style Preferences of Arkansas Adults on Performance, Attitude, and Completion Rates in Distance Education

Vann, Barry
Psychological and Sociological Factors Affecting Student Retention in Workplace GED Programs

University Of British Columbia

Beno, Jane
Conceptions of Instruction in the Workplace

Butterwick, Shauna Jane
A Study of Three Canadian Job Strategy-Funded Job-Entry Programs for Women

Clark, Roger Allen
Successful Illiterate Men

Cousins, Sandra Jean
The Determinants of Late Life Exercise in Women Over Age 70

University Of Georgia

Carr, Camille
An Ethic of Care: A Moral Dilemma for Lawyers

Des Reis, Richard
Extent of Formal Training in Georgia's Manufacturing Industries

McKinney, Catherine
The Meaning of Teaching to Adult Educators

Melichar, Barbara
Attitudes of Postsecondary Vocational Technical Instructors Toward Two Age Groups of Adult Students

Taylor, Edward
A Learning Model of Becoming Interculturally Competent: A Transformative Process

Wright, Barbara
Current Practices of Workplace Literacy Programs of Fortune 500 and Service 500 Companies

University of Illinois - Champaign/Urbana

Wilson, Barbara
An Analysis of Continuing Education and Development Designed for Baby-Boomer Alumni

University Of Minnesota

Darling, Mary
Self-Directed Nutrition Learning Activity of Women 50 Years of Age and Older: The Extent and Quality of Participation as Related to Self-Efficacy

Milk, Martha
A Delphic Perspective for the Year 2010 on Continuing Education for Public Health Educators.

Walker, Joyce A.
Women's Voices, Women's Lives: Understandings From Women's Twenty-Four Year Correspondence

University of Missouri - St. Louis

Hickman, Clark J.
The Structure of Instructional Criteria in Corporate Settings

University Of Missouri-Columbia

Childers, Jeri
Assessing the Reasons for Participation in Continuing Professional Education: A Study of the Relationship Between Attitudes, Work Setting and Structure of a Professionalizing Occupation

Edwards, Mary
An Analysis of the Relationships Between Personal Variables and Work Environment Perceptions of Nursing Assistants Employed in a Nursing Home

Meyers, Jr, Randall
Missouri Superintendents' Perceptions of Process--Oriented Community Education
University Of Missouri-Kansas City

Koehler, Carol
The Effectiveness of Deconstructive Teaching Strategies on Student's Critical Thinking Skills

McClelland, Patricia
A Case Study of One Black Male College Student in a Predominantly White Institution

University Of North Texas

Coutryer, Sharon M.
Perceptions of Care Providers Concerning the Normalization/Developmental Model's Replacement of the Medical Model as the Basis for Providing Education and Training to the Institutionalized Adult Wtih Developmental Disabilities

Funck, James
Gowin's Knowledge Vee: A Heuristic For Adult Religious Education

University Of Texas At Austin

Girard, Nancy
The Ability of Adults to Perform Mental Tasks in a Perioperative Environment

Jackle, Mary
Contingent Employment in Nursing: Factors Affecting Career Choice

Lam, Pui-kiu (Abel)
Education for Change: The People-Centered Theory of James Yen

Lewis, Kevin
An Analysis of Commitment to Continuous Quality Improvement: Perceptions of Trigger Events and Pre-Existing Values

Rosenberger, Michal
The Role Acquisition Process of a Local School Board Member in Texas

Sanders, Larry
The Impact of Performance Appraisal Interviews on Organizational Trust and Readiness for Learning

University of Toronto

Baker, Janette
The Integration of Self-Directed Learning Strategies in Undergraduate, Distance Education Courses in Canadian Universites

Brady, Brian F.
Perceptions of Personal Growth During Adulthood: A Study of Eight Adults to Midlife

Burge, Elizabeth
Student's Perceptions of Learning in Computer Conferencing: A Qualitative Analysis

Johnston, Ray
Self Directed Learning in a New Occupational Race

Kops, William
Self-Planned Learning Efforts of Managers in an Organizational Context

Lavery, Raymond Hamilton
Teachers' Experience in Implementing a Changed Perspective

Nutter, Brenda
How Parents Change During Child Welfare Transitions

O'Conner, J Antony
The Crucible of Learning: An Examination of Adult Learning in Clinical Pastoral Education

Oussoren, Jan (John)
From Preacher to Politician: T.C. Douglas' Transition

Weaver, Susan
The Validity of Extended and Untimed Testing for Postsecondary Students with Learning Disabilities

Whelan, Mary Josephine
Enhancing Self-Esteem in Adult Basic Education

Zhong, Wenhui
China's Participation in the World Community: A Study of Chinese Scholarly Communication

Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University

Boland, Wiley
Sempre Educare: The History of Marine Corps General 1739-1993

Colborn, Anne
Learning to Combine Practice and Research: An Emerging Role in Occupational Therapy

Dwyer, Richard
Informal Learning in the Police Subculture: A Case Study of Probationary Special Agents of a Federal Criminal Investigative Agency

Morton, Shirley
Socialization-Related Learning, Job Satisfaction, and Commitment for New Employees in a Federal Agency

Okpara, Onwuckawkwa
An Application of Patricia Cross's Chain of Response Model to Educational Interest/Participation of Public Housing Residents-A Case Study Approach